

MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE  
**CENTRAL AFRICA WORLD HERITAGE  
FOREST INITIATIVE (CAWHFI)**



A Report to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Division: FOMC

Index: 3022363

**January 2008**

**Dr J.P. d'Huart**

**Cover picture: Gorillas in Mondika, Nouabalé-Ndoki NP, Congo. Courtesy of Rémy Ledauphin, WCS.**

# Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Contents</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>I. Executive Summary</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <i>Abbreviations</i>  | 4         |
| <b>II. Introduction</b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i>   | 6         |
| <b>III. Background and Context</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design</b>                    | <b>10</b> |
| A. <i>Justification of the concept</i>                                    | 10        |
| B. <i>Assessment of the objectives</i>                                    | 12        |
| C. <i>Assessment of Project Design</i>                                    | 15        |
| <b>V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management</b> | <b>26</b> |
| A. <i>Project Budget and Expenditure</i>                                  | 26        |
| B. <i>Activities and Outputs</i>  | 27        |
| C. <i>Government Support</i>  | 31        |
| D. <i>Project Management</i>  | 32        |
| E. <i>Technical and Operational Backstopping</i>                          | 35        |
| <b>VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness</b>                        | <b>36</b> |
| A. <i>Effects and Impact</i>  | 36        |
| B. <i>Sustainability of Results</i>                                       | 38        |
| C. <i>Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results</i>             | 39        |
| D. <i>Cost-Effectiveness</i>  | 40        |
| E. <i>Major Factors Affecting the Project Results</i>                     | 40        |
| <b>VII. Conclusions and Recommendations</b>                               | <b>43</b> |
| A. <i>Conclusions</i>   | 43        |
| B. <i>Recommendations</i>   | 45        |
| <b>VIII. Lessons Learned</b>  | <b>47</b> |
| <b>IX. Annexes</b>  | <b>48</b> |

## I. Executive Summary

CAWHFI is a partnership between UNF, 2 UN agencies and 3 NGOs, geared towards strengthening the management quality of outstanding Central African protected areas, with a view of facilitating their addition to the World Heritage List. The landscape approach and the promotion of transboundary cooperation by the project have been designed as a support to the Yaoundé Declaration, and are a direct contribution to the implementation of the COMIFAC *Plan de Convergence*. The project has 3 immediate objectives which concern respectively the improvement of selected PAs management, the improvement of natural resources management in peripheral zones, and the use of the World Heritage image to improve protected areas management and develop long-term financing mechanisms. The second objective is the subject of a specific component funded by FFEM which started later than CAWHFI/UNF, and the original project logframe was adapted to incorporate this addition.

In complement of these common strategic values, the partners have built their alliance on a principle of co-funding, by which UNF financial contribution is matched by ONG funds on a 1-to-1 basis. Part of UNF funding allows UNESCO and FAO to take both an administrative and a technical role in the project. The overall management of CAWHFI is ensured by UNESCO/ WHC through a project officer based in Paris and a regional coordinator based in Libreville. A project Steering Committee, composed of all the project partners and the Wildlife Directors of all 4 beneficiary countries, meets once a year to evaluate progress and discuss project development. The present mid-term evaluation was planned in the normal project cycle. Its scope includes an analysis of the relevance, design, structure, efficiency, cost-effectiveness, results, sustainability, and challenges of the project. It formulates a series of recommendations and draws a few lessons learnt. The evaluation mission was conducted by Dr J.P. d'Huart, who visited UNESCO/ WHC, 5 CAWHFI sites, and the project partners and national authorities in 4 capital cities between 11 November and 15 December 2007.

The evaluation acknowledges the justification and high relevance of the objectives of this project. It notes, however, several inconsistencies in the formulation of some sections in the logical framework, and regrets that the revised logframe has not been finalized. Indeed, without impact indicators, most of the outputs of the project are not measurable. The strength of the project design comes from the fact that it was developed in a very systematic and participatory manner. Despite this, CAWHFI suffered somehow from the over-ambitious responsibilities accepted by its partners in terms of project management. A number of functions, particularly some attributed to the project Steering Committee, could not be met. As the facilitator of this Committee, UNESCO/ WHC successfully managed to coordinate the administrative and contractual aspects of the project, but the evaluation found that a clearer apportionment of responsibilities between the project officer and the regional coordinator is necessary.

The rigidity of the co-funding arrangement and the complex administrative system have caused multiple delays in the signing of contracts and the disbursement of the project budget. As for previous reviews of similar partnership, this evaluation is calling for a simplification of these systems, as they constitute hindrances to the very activities that they are supposed to help. Moreover, they may threaten the solidity of the partnership, as key NGO partners may eventually pull out of the alliance because of their inability (or reluctance) to follow the rules imposed. These delays have caused a rather slight (10%) budget under-spending and the deferment of some activities, but most of the key activities were realized.

The evaluation found that in general the activities were dealt with efficiency, and produced positive outputs, particularly under Objective 1. Although the project impact may not yet be measurable, the conservation status of CAWHFI sites might already be better. This is due mostly to the basic support of the project in terms of additional staffing, training, infrastructure, equipment and parks running operations. The enhanced level of protection and surveillance of a wider territory seems to keep the most destructive poaching at bay in most sites. The sustainability of this output, however, must still be consolidated by the development of financial mechanisms (planned in Year 3 and 4) and by focusing training on national trainers and senior park staff. Without a specific strategy aiming at building the wardens capacity to perform all aspects of parks management, the project will perpetuate the extreme dependency of Central African parks systems toward external partners.

Progress made on other aspects of the project, like a higher visibility of CAWHFI, a better communication on the values of World Heritage and the preparation of national Tentative Lists, the development of positive relationships with operators in contiguous zones, or the awareness raising of local judicial authorities and police forces, are considered and commented upon.

A greater effectiveness could be reached by strengthening the linkages between the project and several other regional initiatives, particularly with RAPAC. These synergies were foreseen in the project document but have not been formalized yet, despite the many advantages in doing so. The involvement and support from the governments and from the central administrations are considered to be weak and insufficient. In spite of the political will expressed by the Heads of States, the sites managers and the project are not operating in an enabling environment. The project has to live and to cope with the immense threats posed by extractive industries on the landscapes natural resources, without a strong support from the national authorities. This challenge is taken up in different ways by the project, but the evaluation suggests additional ways, not yet set in motion, to tackle this issue.

The cost-effectiveness of CAWHFI is considered as satisfactory. The project, as designed and implemented so far, has thus served as an effective means for achieving the immediate project objectives within the limit of the available resources. Considering the 2 objectives of CAWHFI under this evaluation and the results obtained so far in the project phase, it is the opinion of the evaluator that the same resources could not have been used for an alternative design that would have produced the same results more effectively. The approach seems thus on the right track, but, as mentioned in various section of this report, there are still several key activities – both planned and unplanned - to undertake in the second part of this phase in order to meet the objectives of CAWHFI by 2010.

In this regard, 12 specific recommendations clearly addressed to one or several partners are formulated in this report, and deal with the project structure, management, collaboration and linkages, and ongoing and complementary activities that would help CAWHFI reach its objectives.

## **Abbreviations**

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| CARPE   | Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (USAID)                               |
| CARPO   | Central Africa Regional Programme Office (WWF)  |
| CAWHFI  | Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative   |
| CBD     | Convention on Biological Diversity  |
| CBFP    | Congo Basin Forest Partnership  |
| CI      | Conservation International  |
| CNPN    | Conseil National des Parcs Nationaux (Gabon)  |
| COMIFAC | Commission des forêts d'Afrique centrale  |
| CTC     | Cyber Tracker Conservation  |
| EC      | European Commission   |
| ECOFAC  | Conservation et utilisation rationnelle des écosystèmes d'Afrique centrale (EC Programme) |
| EoH     | Enhancing our Heritage (UNF/UNESCO/IUCN project)  |
| FFEM    | Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial   |
| FORAF   | Observatoire des forêts d'Afrique centrale  |
| FR      | Faunal Reserve  |
| GEF     | Global Environment Facility   |
| GTZ     | Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Cooperation)                  |
| JGI     | Jane Goodall Institute  |
| MAB     | Man and Biosphere   |
| MEFCPE  | Ministère des eaux, forêts, chasse, pêche chargé de l'environnement (CAR)                 |
| MEFE    | Ministère de l'économie forestière et de l'environnement (Congo)                          |
| MEFEPPN | Ministère de l'économie forestière, des eaux, de la pêche et des parcs nationaux (Gabon)  |
| MINFOF  | Ministère des forêts et de la faune (Cameroun)  |
| NGO     | Non Governmental Organization   |
| NP      | National Park   |
| OAB     | Organisation africaine du bois  |
| OCFSA   | Organisation pour la conservation de la faune sauvage en Afrique                          |
| OIBT    | Organisation internationale des bois tropicaux  |
| PA      | Protected area  |
| PoWPA   | Programme of Work on Protected Areas (CBD)  |
| RAPAC   | Réseau des Aires Protégées d'Afrique Centrale   |
| SC      | Steering Committee  |
| TNS     | Tri-National de la Sangha   |
| TOR     | Terms of Reference  |
| TRIDOM  | Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe   |
| UNDP    | United Nations Development Programme  |
| UNESCO  | United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization                                |
| UNF     | United Nations Foundation   |
| UNFIP   | United Nations Fund for International Partnership   |
| USAID   | United States Agency for International Development  |
| USFWS   | United States Fish and Wildlife Service   |
| WCPA    | World Commission on Protected Areas   |
| WCS     | Wildlife Conservation Society   |
| WHC     | World Heritage Center   |
| WPC     | World Parks Congress  |
| WWF     | World Wildlife Fund/ World Wide Fund for Nature   |

## **II. Introduction**

Two evaluations of CAWHFI have been planned in this first phase of the project: a formal mid-term evaluation at the end of Year 2 and a final evaluation towards the end of Year 4. The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to make an assessment the UNF component of the project; the FFEM component, which joined the Initiative later (see below), will have its own evaluation at later stage. However, during the evaluation mission, the consultant has collaborated closely with the coordinator of the FFEM component - who is also the CAWHFI regional coordinator based in Libreville - and who provided valuable insights and technical support to the mission.

This mid-term evaluation is intended to review progresses made towards the objectives, identify bottlenecks and opportunities, and provide recommendations to the project partners on further steps needed to consolidate progress and ensure achievement of the objectives by the end of the project. The evaluation is also expected to make recommendations on any changes in the overall design and orientation of the project.

According to the terms of reference of the mission (Annex 1), the scope of the evaluation includes an assessment of the following topics:

- a)** Relevance of the project to development priorities and needs.
- b)** Clarity and realism of the project's development and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability.
- c)** Quality, clarity and adequacy of project design including:
  - clarity and logical consistency between inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives;
  - realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites;
  - realism and clarity of external institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan.
- d)** Efficiency and adequacy of project's implementation including: availability of funds as compared with budget for the donor, implementing agencies and partners in the field; the quality and timeliness of input delivery by both implementation agencies and the partner NGOs; managerial and work efficiency; difficulties of implementation; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the extent of national support and commitment; and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by UNESCO and FAO.
- e)** Project's results, including a systematic assessment of outputs produced to date, including a review of the status and quality of work on World Heritage status of potential protected area sites.
- f)** Prospects for sustaining the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project.
- g)** Cost-effectiveness of the project.

Based on the analysis of these issues, the mission report draws specific conclusions and makes proposals for further action to ensure a sustainable development. The report also draws attention to various lessons learnt of general interest. Its structure follows the standard format "Outline of an On-going Evaluation Project Report" requested by FAO.

The mission was composed of only one independent evaluation consultant (J.P. d'Huart). In its development stage, it was foreseen that the FAO Regional Forest Officer (J.C. Nguingiri) would join the mission, but this was unfortunately prevented by administrative obstacles. Visits were made to 5 (out of 12) of the CAWHFI sites, and to national authorities and project partners in the 4 capital cities. The timetable, itinerary, and people met by the mission are reported in Annex 2; the list of consulted documents and other materials of reference are in Annex 3.

### ***Acknowledgements***

The evaluator would like to express his heartfelt thanks to the many people who provided their kind help in order to ensure a logistical support and a smooth progress of this mission, in particular:

Brigitte Carr, Bryan Curran, René Czudek, Guy Debonnet, Pauwel De Wachter, Cédric Hance, Rémy Ledauphin, Jean-Christophe Lefeuvre, Gustave Mabaza, Firmin Mahoungou, Louis Ngono, Jean-Claude Nguingiri, Vincent Ngwanye, Solange Njofon, Cyril Pélissier, Laurent Somé, Léonard Usongo, Hilde Vanleeuwe, and Jean Bernard Yarissem.



### III. Background and Context

The Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI) seeks to improve the sustainable management of selected clusters of protected areas of three outstanding ecological landscapes of the Congo Basin. CAWHFI's vision is:

*A network of outstanding trans-border clusters of protected areas and new World Heritage sites whose integrity is maintained and where successful control of illegal hunting and effective regulation of commercial trade in bushmeat constitute an example and an inspiration for the management of tropical forest areas in Central Africa and elsewhere.*

The project is implemented jointly by 2 UN agencies: UNESCO / World Heritage Center (WHC) and UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in collaboration with the Protected Areas Management Authorities of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, and Republic of Congo, as well as 3 international conservation NGO: Conservation International/CyberTracker Conservation, Wildlife Conservation Society and World Wildlife Fund for Nature<sup>1</sup>.

The funding of CAWHFI is provided by United Nations Foundation (UNF) and includes matching funds from the NGO partners and their contributing donors. The UNF funded component of the project is operating with **a budget of US\$ 6,787,360 for 4 years, from which the UNF contribution represents US\$ 6,600,000 and includes US\$ 3,300,000 of matching funds secured by conservation NGOs.**

After a series of identification and formulation workshops in Libreville, Yaoundé and Paris in 2001 and 2002, the project document was signed on 9 May 2003 and the project started on 1 June 2004 with the first instalment transferred to UNESCO. With a grant extension approved by UNF on 1 February 2007, the expected project completion date is now 1 June 2010.

In 2005, UNESCO/WHC attracted the support from the *Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial*, who joined the partnership with funds allocated to specific activities in the peripheral zones of CAWHFI selected PAs. With the additional 2.5 M € contributed by FFEM, **the total budget of CAWHFI programme is now 9.5 M US\$ (7.93 M€) for 2005-2010, with an almost equal share between UNF (33%), FFEM (32%) and the NGOs (35%).**

CAWHFI's activities are implemented in **three ecological transboundary landscapes** (Annex 9):

1. **Sangha Tri-National (TNS):** a landscape composed of Lobeke National Park (Cameroon), Dzanga Sangha complex of protected areas (Central African Republic), and Nouabalé-Ndoki National Park (Congo).
2. **Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe (TRIDOM):** a landscape composed of Minkebe NP (Gabon), Odzala-Kokoua NP (Congo) and the Dja Faunal Reserve and World Heritage Site (Cameroon). The Cameroonian part of TRIDOM also includes the newly created Boumba Bek and Nki National Parks.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Jane Goodall Institute (JGI) was initially member of the partnership but withdrew as it encountered difficulties to raise the appropriate amount of matching funds.

3. **Gamba-Conkouati:** a landscape composed of the Gamba complex of protected areas (Gabon), the Mayumba NP (Gabon) and the Conkouati-Douli NP (Congo).

Together, these three complexes include 12 protected areas covering more than 60,000 km<sup>2</sup>. With their peripheral buffer zones included in the ecological landscapes, the total project area exceeds 230,000 km<sup>2</sup>. These three transboundary areas are among the original 11 CBFP Landscapes identified as focal areas and planning units by the CARPE project (PFBC 2006). By selecting these landscapes and focusing its field activities on the quality of parks management and on developing a constructive interface with neighbouring groups, the CAWHFI project has the ambition to contribute to key commitments made by the Heads of States in the 1999 Yaoundé Declaration. Indeed, these 2 objectives and 3 transboundary landscapes are at the heart of the COMIFAC's *Plan de Convergence*, which materializes the political will to sustainably conserve the natural resources of the Congo Basin.

In addition to CARPE, several **other conservation initiatives** whose objectives are particularly relevant with CAWHFI, are taking place in the sub-region. Among them, the following are worth mentioning:

- ECOFAC: after a long period of dormancy (June 2004 – June 2007), this EU-funded programme has recently resumed its activities in the context of a last 3-year phase. Odzala-Kokoua NP and Dja FR are two important TRIDOM sites which benefit both from CAWHFI and ECOFAC support. It is thus foreseen that ECOFAC, which took an active part to the project identification workshops, will join CAWHFI's Steering Committee as it was planned in the project document (CAWHFI 2003).
- RAPAC: this network of protected areas professionals from the sub-region is also officially mandated by COMIFAC to drive the technical components related to PAs in the *Plan de Convergence*. Among other priorities, RAPAC is intending to promote high standards of PA management within its "pilot sites" – all CAWHFI sites are included - and to collect and manage key information and data from them (RAPAC 2007, Annex 8). A close collaboration between CAWHFI and RAPAC on these aspects is thus expected.
- UNDP/GEF: a PDF-B project on the "conservation of transboundary biodiversity in the interzone Cameroon-Congo-Gabon (Dja-Odzala-Minkebe) was developed by WWF in 2002 and endorsed by the GEF Council in 2004; the project document, approved in 2006, is expected to start in 2008 for 7 years. Its US\$ 10M budget includes activities in the TRIDOM landscape that are very complementary to those of CAWHFI.

The **problems and constraints** addressed by CAWHFI in the selected sites are numerous and of diverse nature. The most important issues that contribute (directly or indirectly) to the threats on the sites or to weaknesses in their management can be summarized as follows:

- Widespread illegal hunting and bushmeat trade;
- Wide availability of firearms;
- Illegal commercial fishing (Gamba/Mayumba/Conkouati);
- Inadequate environmental and conservation legislation;
- Lack of law enforcement;
- Lack of harmonization among national legislations;
- Allocation of extractive concessions within PA limits;
- Insufficient collaboration among public administrations services;
- Inadequate infrastructure, equipment, staffing and budget in protected areas;
- Poor staff management policy in national parks systems;
- Lack of professional capacity in various fields of parks management;

- Absence of (or ineffective) management- and wildlife plans;
- Lack of environmental awareness and of alternative resources for livelihood in neighbouring rural communities;
- Lack of participation of private sector (forest, mining, oil, hunting, fishing) companies in conservation activities;
- Lack of sustainable financing mechanisms.

At the time of project approval, the **institutional setting** at the level of the parks administration was a classic chain of command between national Ministries, their Wildlife and Parks Department, and their sites management. As mentioned in the project document (CAWHFI 2003), NGOs and ECOFAC were running active projects in each of the selected CAWHFI sites and were already collaborating with the site managers in support to the conservation of those parks and reserves. At around the same period, the USAID-funded CARPE project started its activities which were implemented by the same conservation NGOs. Several CAWHFI activities proposed at the identification workshops therefore coincide with needs identified in earlier reports and at other workshops held at national and regional levels. The CAWHFI project thus seeks to *“build on current national initiatives and develop synergies rather than create an entirely new set of activities”*.

In order to tackle these aspects in an integrated manner, the project choose to work closely with national counterparts: the national ministries and departments responsible for tropical forest conservation and the protected area management authorities. Their representatives are members of the **project Steering Committee** and of the various **regional coordination committees**. This institutional setting has not changed since the project inception, with the exception of Gabon, where the parks management agency (CNPN, formerly under the President’s Office) has recently been integrated as a parastatal under the Ministry (MEFEPPN).

Partner’s dialogue on the project implementation began in 2006 with a first meeting of the CAWHFI Steering Committee (Libreville, 13-17 February 2006). It aimed at presenting the progresses made during the first year of program implementation, and led to interesting experience sharing among participants. The steering committee began with a two-day technical meeting where NGO partners gathered with UNESCO and UNF representatives to discuss and adopt key strategic orientation and continued with a workshop involving all national park chief wardens of CAWHFI sites and wildlife country directors. The main topics discussed during this workshop focused on the reinforcement of landscape integration, transboundary collaboration and negotiation, and the adoption of joint activities work plans (CAWHFI 2006b).

In 2007, a second annual meeting of the CAWHFI Steering Committee took place in Libreville on 21-22 March, after a technical workshop held on March 19-20. The participants reviewed the progress made during Year 2, and working groups discussed and recommended key thematic actions (wildlife management, ecotourism, and conservation sustainability) for a more effective implementation of the project. The content of the FFEM component as well as the role of the new regional coordinator were presented. The selection of 7 beneficiary sites, the detailed content of FFEM component under CAWHFI Objective 2, as well as the complementarities between components were discussed (CAWHFI 2007b).

## IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design

### A. *Justification of the concept*

The initial motivation for this project is the concern about the severe impact of the bushmeat trade on forest biodiversity that was shared by both the UN agencies and the participating NGOs. Given UNF's programmatic priority to help conserve biodiversity by assisting developing countries to better conserve their flora and fauna through a specific focus on World Heritage sites, the original initiative was broadened and further adapted to meet with UNF's Biodiversity Program Framework's stated mission to promote cooperation between UN agencies.

Beyond the specific objectives of the project (section B, below), the concept of the CAWHFI alliance was based on **three specific approaches**:

- Forge a new kind of partnership;
- Contribute to support the Yaoundé commitments;
- Link the project with existing conservation initiatives.

- 1. A new kind of partnership:** the project document refers to this Initiative as providing "*the opportunity for an innovative alliance*" between UN agencies, NGOs, other bilateral and multilateral bodies active in forest conservation in Central Africa, and national authorities. It states that "*each organization places its own network, experience and expertise at the disposal of the CAWHFI project*". The document suggests the nature of the inputs that each partner would bring in the alliance. This kind of UNF/UN/NGOs partnership has been activated since 1999 in many other UNF-funded projects (UNF 2003 and 2005), and its effectiveness assessed. The use of such an original mix of competences and networks in a multi-stakeholders partnership is potentially extremely efficient, but its success depends on the genuine sharing of common values, the quality of coordination, and the flexibility in administrative management. This report shows that this alliance has produced solid results, but that weaknesses in some of these aspects have also hindered the efficiency of the CAWHFI partnership.
- 2. A contribution to the Yaoundé Declaration:** there is no doubt that CAWHFI contributes directly to implementing the commitments made in 1999 by 6 Heads of States of the Congo Basin countries. The Declaration states their willingness to strengthen regional coordination in order to implement an ambitious plan for the sustainable management of their forests including the legal protection of 10% of the forest area, particularly in transboundary ecosystems. The subsequent creation of the COMIFAC, the elaboration of its *Plan de Convergence*, and the launching of the CBFP are all clear signals of the determination of those countries and of the international community to work in that direction. CAWHFI, as well as all major conservation initiatives taking place in the sub-region, has anchored its 3 objectives in some of the *Plan de Convergence* strategic themes. In order to accurately measure the progress made by CAWHFI's contribution towards the *Plan's* objectives (and not only its own), there should be a closer link between CAWHFI's Steering Committee who must assess the project performances and the organizations mandated by COMIFAC to drive all the activities towards those objectives. Since RAPAC is the institution that was mandated to coordinate sub-regional activities related to protected areas management and biodiversity conservation, a much closer link

between CAWHFI and RAPAC in the field of coordination and information management would be expected in this regard.

- 3. A link between CAWHFI and existing conservation initiatives:** in some cases, this link is ensured by the fact that the same NGOs are the implementing partners (CARPE) or the developers (WWF: GEF/UNDP TRIDOM project) of major projects whose objectives are fully complementary to those of CAWHFI. As an example of this integration, WCS is planning and monitoring its CAWHFI activities in Conkouati also on the basis of the CARPE planning matrix. In other cases, the strength of the link depends on the strength of the other conservation initiatives. The ECOFAC programme has been on hold between two phases since the start of CAWHFI, while it was considered a full partner and a member of its Steering Committee. The inactivity of ECOFAC during the first two years of CAWHFI has obviously had negative impacts on the conservation of two sites, Dja and Odzala-Kokoua, where ECOFAC was meant to take a lead role. It has probably had another impact on the slow development of the RAPAC, which was also designed by ECOFAC as a local tool to perpetuate, anchor and amplify its achievements. Since RAPAC has recently strengthened its own strategic plan, which is quite naturally including a number of priorities similar to CAWHFI's, the link between both initiatives should be institutionalized and much closer than it is now. This could be made easier by the fact that CAWHFI's regional coordinator occupies an office in RAPAC premises.

The concept of CAWHFI is fully justified as far as it provides a practical response to the **urgent needs for strengthening forest conservation and developing sustainable natural resource use** in the Congo Basin. Its geographical approach, through the selection of three transboundary clusters of PAs, is consistent with the approach selected by COMIFAC under its *Plan de Convergence* and supported by CBFP and the CARPE project. In addition, the project selected 3 vast ecological landscapes whose originality and biological importance are acknowledged to be among the highest in the sub-region. Providing a significant improvement of their management and conservation status (which is the target of Objective 1), these PAs also offer their host countries the opportunity to have them inscribed on the World Heritage List. This would help those countries, as Party States, to fulfill their commitment with regard to the World Heritage Convention.

The project is intending to demonstrate its **social significance** by developing a positive interface with neighbouring communities and user groups, which would be conducive to biodiversity conservation and sustainable resource exploitation. The approaches taken to achieve this involve village dialogue committees, alternative development projects, environmental awareness and sensitization programmes, agreements with communities and private companies, etc. Rightly enough, the project objectives or its expected outcomes do not specify that the Initiative would be contributing at alleviating poverty in the targeted landscapes. However, the context in which the activities of the FFEM-funded component (CAWHFI Objective 2) are implemented take full consideration of the socio-economic context of the local societies and include projects that do improve their well-being. This aspect of CAWHFI will be the subject of a separate FFEM evaluation at a later stage.

The concept of the project includes an important consideration to the **durability** of the Initiative. In its implementation strategy, it focuses a significant amount of effort into building the capacity of national staff and on professional systems in view of raising the management quality and setting the conservation status of the targeted sites and landscapes on a stronger foot. This expected scenario pre-supposes that these staff and systems are/ will eventually be

able to operate effectively within national administration system, policies and practices conducive to overall good governance, which is currently not the case. In its concern of sharing information and decisions on the project with national authorities, the project Steering Committee involves the Wildlife Directors of all 4 countries.

However, a significant amount of **constraints and threats** currently faced by CAWHFI (Section III above) are due to incoherent decisions by the governments, interference by influential people, inadequate law enforcement, obstruction by central administrations, etc., which could all be alleviated by a genuine political will and a concern for internal coherence. This may reinforce the idea that biodiversity conservation issues tend to appear relatively low in the countries' (and people's) priority list as long as conservation projects have a high cost and do not generate wealth and tangible economic returns.

Conscious of this, the designers of CAWHFI have conceptualized a project with a **long term intervention** time span (10 years), and have included in its activities specific efforts to develop **sustainable funding mechanisms**. Among these, the economic valuation of parks natural resources through tourism bears a very serious potential, but requires both a significant capital investment from the private sector and an enabling policy and operational environment from the host country. Other mechanisms like trust funds and national funds fuelled by taxes are being envisaged by CAWHFI partners; the development of these will be the subject of concerted efforts in the second half of this project phase.

Considering this context, the various approaches planned by the CAWHFI partners seem very relevant. The cost-effectiveness of its support to PAs management varies from one PA to another, but is deemed to be generally good as the project (and other interventions by other partners) seems to succeed in keeping the most destructive poaching at bay. The validity of this approach to sustain positive results produced by the project will, however, depend on some readjustments that are needed to mitigate the existing constraints.

## **B. Assessment of the objectives**

### **B.1 Project objective statements and revision**

At the time of its original formulation (2002), the **overall objective** of CAWHFI was to

*“Promote and support the building of management regimes for Central Africa forest protected areas that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status and effectively combat the principal threats of illegal hunting and unregulated bushmeat trade”.*

After the adjunction of the FFEM component (2006 - see below), this overall objective became:

*“Improve sustainable management of forest landscapes of the Congo Basin in supporting and promoting the development of protected area management regimes for Central Africa forests that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status”.*

The introduction of “forest landscapes” instead of “forest protected areas” as main project operative units reflects not only the stronger accent put on activities in the PAs peripheral zones, but also the similitude of spatial concept and methodological approach shared with CBFP and CARPE. While the promotion and support to high quality management of selected

PAs were the sole focus of the original project, it became the main project methodology to achieve the improvement of “*sustainable management of forest landscapes*”.

Similarly, the formulation of the **three immediate objectives** was adapted at the 2006 Steering Committee meeting to reflect the extended scope of the combined programme. From its original formulation (2002):

1. *Combat illegal hunting and regulate bushmeat trade;*
2. *Strengthen law enforcement for the protection of selected protected areas, linking corridors and their buffer zones;*
3. *Use the World Heritage image to improve protected areas management and long-term financing.*

The new **immediate objectives of the project** became:

1. *Improve the management of selected protected areas of potential outstanding universal value;*
2. *Improve natural resource management, particularly wildlife, in the forest landscape around selected protected areas of outstanding universal value;*
3. *Use the World Heritage image to improve protected areas management and long-term financing.*

The original CAWHFI-UNF immediate objectives 1 and 2 were consolidated in the **first objective** that now includes in its concept of “management improved” the former focus on combating illegal hunting, regulating the bushmeat trade and strengthening the law enforcement. It is surprising to note the addition and repetition of “potential outstanding universal value” after “selected protected areas”, as it only refers to a *possible* future World heritage status, but it makes a useful link between Objectives 1 and 2, and Objective 3.

The **second objective** now refers mainly to the FFEM component. According to its own project document (FFEM 2005), this component is specifically aiming at:

1. *building capacity in the periphery of protected areas as to allow community-based wildlife resources management;*
2. *elaborating wildlife management plans for these areas with all stakeholders;*
3. *implementing and monitoring wildlife management plans.*

This objective also includes several activities initially planned in the original CAWHFI-UNF project, which were expected to be implemented by JGI. It goes, however, much further in working with local population and other stakeholders living and working in the protected areas peripheral zones.

The **third objective** remained unchanged. It seeks to raise local, national and international awareness on the “outstanding universal value” of selected protected areas, and to elevate management regimes to a level that would be acceptable under the World Heritage criteria.

## **B.2 Reappraisal of the project objectives**

Globally, the topics concerned by the 3 immediate objectives of CAWHFI are quite clear, and the formulation of these objectives is sufficiently broad to encompass a wide range of activities that can fit into the subject and be adapted to a particular country or circumstance. Indeed, the conservation status and the level of management of PAs and their surrounding zones are different from one country to another. Since all the selected areas do need a considerable support in order to strengthen and professionalize these types of management, it is felt that this relatively vague formulation of objectives is acceptable, provided the logical framework offers sufficient precision concerning the expected results and the performance indicators at the landscape level. However, it does not seem relevant or useful to mention that the selected PAs are “of potential universal value”, since this was a criteria for selection of sites since the inception of the project and also the justification for its name.

The formulation of Objective 3 and its contribution to the overall objective seems less clear and less realistic. Indeed, the “World Heritage image” is not yet a concept that is widely accepted by some NGOs and some Central African countries as a truly efficient tool to improve the management of protected areas. There are some questions or doubt concerning the true benefits that the World Heritage status actually brings to a listed site and to its host country. Previous experiences with the fate of Manovo - Gounda - St Floris NP in CAR and, to a lesser extent, with Dja FR in Cameroon, have brought some confusion about the support that State Parties can expect from the international community in difficult times. In addition, the present formulation of Objectives 1 and 3 does not suggest *how* their achievement would generate PAs management regimes “that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status”. However, this formulation is not worth modifying at this stage, but, as a matter of urgency, a thorough explanation of these aspects, based on the text of the World Heritage Convention and on its Operational Guidelines ([Annex 6](#)), should be done to all project partners and to national authorities at all levels. Also, a wide circulation of UNESCO Report on the outcomes of the last World Park Congress (UNESCO 2005c) would help stakeholders and interested parties to better apprehend the added values of World Heritage nominations.

An important aspect of the CAWHFI project is that its objectives (as well as the complete logical framework) have been selected and formulated by the partners themselves, which theoretically should ensure a high level of ownership on their part. The **relevance** of these objectives is obvious, as they were designed to respond to recognized weaknesses (Objective 1) and pressures (Objective 2) that still today are crucially affecting the conservation of PAs and their landscapes. Their relevance is reinforced by the fact that CAWHFI has chosen a transboundary, landscape-wide approach, with a geographical focus on sites that were later included in Landscapes selected by CARPE and retained by COMIFAC in its *Plan de Convergence*. CAWHFI Objectives 1 and 2 therefore complete and reinforce strategic priorities and activities of other regional conservation initiatives ([Annex 8](#)).

The **social aspect** of conservation is also taken into account. Instead of including an objective geared towards poverty alleviation, the project aims at improving natural resource management around selected sites. By doing so, CAWHFI hopes to make the foundations of local livelihoods more sustainable and to provide local communities with the means to manage it themselves. Communities are therefore seen as a partner without whom the conservation of the targeted sites could not be sustainably ensured, rather than beneficiaries of conservation funds that should compensate limited access to natural resources. The future evaluation of the FFEM component (Objective 2) of CAWHFI will show whether this is a successful approach.



By focusing on strategic areas selected by COMIFAC to put in practice the principles of the Yaoundé Declaration, CAWHFI works towards the implementation of commitments made by Heads of States. The project contributes also to the commitments made by the States through their signature of the World Heritage Convention. Indeed, CAWHFI's Objectives 1 and 3 intend to enhance the management of those protected areas "of potential outstanding universal value" to a level allowing the countries to get them accepted on the World Heritage List. Given the renewed international importance given to World Heritage sites in specialized conservation fora (cf. Annex 5; CBD 2004), this support also contributes to a future recognition and support by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee and by the wider international community.

## **C. Assessment of Project Design**

### **C.1 Adequacy in the identification of beneficiaries**

The **immediate beneficiaries** of CAWHFI, and the nature of their benefit, are listed in the project document as:

1. the "people of the 4 countries involved in the project" (some of their principal sources of environmental and economic well-being are preserved);
2. the "indigenous and local communities" (long-term livelihood and well-being depend on forest ecosystem integrity);
3. "the economy of the countries involved" (income from their natural resources, especially forestry and - yet underdeveloped - upmarket tourism);
4. "field staff employed through the project" (salaries, training).

It seems quite clear that the beneficiaries listed under the first and the third category are - at least partially - the same people, who will benefit economically from the preservation of areas allowing non extractive use (tourism) and sustainable use (forest) of natural resources. The additional aspect under the first category refers to the (less easily measurable) value of environmental services provided by adequately managed ecological landscapes. If the project is successful, the benefit of the project for local communities and field staff is obvious.

The **secondary beneficiaries** are listed as:

1. the international community (survival of biodiversity and wildlife, ecological services); and
2. UNESCO, FAO, and international conservation organizations (demonstration of the feasibility of setting up an *ad hoc* alliance).

This evaluation does not back the idea that UN agencies and NGOs are beneficiaries of this project because they "will have demonstrated the *feasibility of setting up an international alliance* to improve conservation status of selected sites and promote World heritage". In fact, the feasibility and limitations of such alliance have already been documented at a UNF/ UN/ NGOs "Knowledge Gathering Workshop" convened by UNF in Durban (UNF 2003). The true benefit for the project partners is not the demonstration of the feasibility of their alliance, but the level of its efficiency as an exemplary mechanism and its effectiveness in terms of conservation success.

Given that Objective 3 focuses on the values of World Heritage and the services provided to improve PAs management help submit new candidate sites and secure long term financing, it

is surprising that the four country States are not listed as direct beneficiaries. Considering the full list of the project's benefits, these four countries should in fact have been mentioned as its ultimate beneficiaries.

If the specific needs of each immediate beneficiary are correctly identified and justified in the project concept, there is one aspect of the potential benefits from CAWHFI which could have been addressed more clearly. Indeed, under the third category of beneficiary ("the economy of the countries involved"), the project as it is now does not include major interventions towards a sustainable, profitable forestry or towards the development of upmarket tourism. The economy of the countries will thus benefit from the project *if some additional initiatives* succeed to convince the private sector concerned - especially the professional tour operators - to invest in the infrastructure of the CAWHFI sites and bring international visitors. ECOFAC has tried this for many years in very promising sites like Lopé or Odzala NP, with very limited results. Perhaps the large network of expertise that can be mobilized by UNF and the CAWHFI partners could be activated to that effect.

## C.2 Assessment of the overall project logic

Based on the revised logical framework of CAWHFI ([Annex 4](#)), the adequacy of linkages between the project inputs, activities and outputs can be assessed as follows<sup>2</sup>:

The rationale for support behind **Objective 1** can be found in the formulation of the long-term and immediate objectives: "*improve the management of selected protected areas of potential outstanding universal value*", "*use the World Heritage image to improve protected areas management*" and "*supporting and promoting the development of protected area management regimes (...) that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status*".

The precision brought by the partners in the revised logical framework that the protected areas are "of potential outstanding universal value" can be seen as a clarification (a) of the reason why those sites were selected, (b) that the project will help confirm that their value fits - or not - with the criteria, and (c) that the ultimate aim of CAWHFI in raising the quality of their management is to fulfill the conditions laid out to be accepted on the World Heritage List (UNESCO 2005a).

Even with the rather **clear direction** given by these objectives, the task of improving the management of selected protected areas could justify a very wide range of possible inputs. As needs differ significantly between the various sites, the planning and decision-making mechanisms adopted in the CAWHFI project allow each partner to adapt, on a yearly basis, the project inputs to the evolution of local needs. This necessary measure allows CAWHFI to remain **a flexible and opportunistic project**, and to work towards reaching the objective with the most relevant means. This aspect is widely acclaimed as one of the project strengths.

The financial and technical inputs provided by the project for improving the management of PAs go to three broad categories of activities across all sites:

- 1.1 Human resources: *Provide the protected areas with adequate staffing;*
- 1.2 Material assets: *Improve the park's management infrastructure and equipment;*

---

<sup>2</sup> From this point in the report, the evaluation analysis is restricted to the "UNF component" - i.e. project Objectives 1 and 3 - as required in the mission's Terms of Reference.

1.3 Operations: *Build capacity to enable site-management to design, adopt and operate effective law enforcement regimes.*

The various inputs of the project towards Objective 1 are considered to be among the **most relevant contributions** to the protection of those sites, and those that are the **best possible choice** for the purpose. By providing funding for essential components such as hiring ecoguards and organizing surveillance patrols, the project (and other donors) is providing the countries with the means to keep their best parks alive. Since these areas are on territories of developing countries, and since they are thought to be “of outstanding universal value”, this contribution from the international community is certainly justified, but it also raises the question of sustainability of this approach. The development of funding mechanisms under Objective 3 is addressing this aspect.

In terms of the adequacy between activities and objectives, it seems that **one important aspect related to training is missing**. Indeed, if the goal of the project is to raise the quality of the parks management to a level that meets the conditions for their World Heritage listing, the logical framework should have included specific activities towards the fulfillment of these conditions (cf. [Annex 6](#)). In particular, in view of the absence of a management plan in most of the CAWHFI sites, a support specifically focused on developing such plans and finalizing them before the end of the project phase should have been included. IUCN, who by contract with UNESCO WHC is the main technical advisor on WH natural sites issues (IUCN 2007), has produced a number of publications on PAs management planning and on assessing PAs management effectiveness. Moreover, a UNF/UNESCO/IUCN project named *Enhancing our Heritage* (2001-2006), had for specific aim to demonstrate how using an assessment, monitoring and reporting framework can enhance effective management of World Heritage sites (EoH 2007). A close association in terms of training and development support with that project, mentioned in the project document as “of particular relevance to monitoring and evaluation” would have made much sense.

The rationale behind **Objective 3** has partly been commented above; this objective constitutes also the single most distinctive feature of CAWHFI, which gives the project its true originality and distinctiveness. In its formulation, the project counts on *the use of the World Heritage image to improve protected area management and long-term conservation financing*. In order to achieve this, the following categories of activities are planned:

3.1 Advocacy: *Use annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee as a forum to report on CAWHFI achievements and call for an international and African political commitment to the adoption and realization of Yaoundé Summit principles and other such subregional and regional (African) instruments;*

3.2 Partnership: *Build UN – conservation NGO partnerships and encourage working arrangements to promote World Heritage status to a selected number of Central African protected area complexes for the conservation of biodiversity;*

3.3 Sustainability: *Ensure financing of CAWHFI during the 4-year period and explore possibilities for long term financing of Central African biodiversity conservation through innovative arrangements between UNF, conservation NGOs and other potential donors.*

The first category of activities includes communication, advocacy and lobbying towards more support to the Yaoundé countries. This is very much in line with the agreed philosophy adopted within the CBF, and it is based on the conviction of UNESCO and the other CAWHFI partners that the values carried by the of World Heritage image will attract attention and interest, and constitute a magnet attractive enough to gather more support from the international community. Under this category, the partners intend to assist CAWHFI countries to request assistance from the WH Fund, build up their Tentative List, and carry studies on the

adequacy of the CAWHFI sites with the conditions and criteria for WH listing. In addition to a global call for wider adhesion to the Yaoundé principles, there is also a clear intention to call on the African States for a strict implementation of their commitments. This is of particular importance in view of the multiple obstacles experienced in the field.

Under this objective, there is also the intention to use the project as an experience to test and strengthen UN – NGO partnership to promote World Heritage status. This presupposes that NGOs adhere to the basic assumption that the World Heritage image does improve protected areas management, and that working on it with UN agencies offers significant advantages. The analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of existing UN – NGO partnerships, and the recommendations made at the end of a specific workshop on that subject (UNF 2005) were not incorporated in this project design, but this could be partly done at a future Steering Committee meeting.

The commitment from partners to ensure the funding of the entire 4-year phase of CAWHFI seems a logical pre-requisite, but it presupposes that each partner has secured adequate reserves of matching funds or sources of parallel funds which could cover the financial needs of the project for 4 consecutive years. As the defection of JGI showed, this is a risky assumption given the difficulties to raise not only the required amounts, but also to secure them from sources that are acceptable under the current system. The securing of complementary funds from FFEM shows that the feasibility to involve other major donors in such a project is real. Major efforts in this direction are planned for Years 3 and 4.

### **C.3 Adequacy of project outputs**

When the project logical framework was revised in 2006, the new version produced by UNESCO WHC with inputs from the Steering Committee did, very unfortunately, not include the formulation of intermediary outputs. In the original version of 2002 though, both outputs at the objectives level and intermediary outputs at the level of activities, were described. In the revised logframe, the outputs have been re-formulated as generic activities, and the classification “outputs” has been taken out. Moreover, the list of *outputs* has become *expected outcomes* in the project progress report for 2005 (UNESCO & FAO 2006), which is somehow confusing and does not demonstrate a strict adherence to logical framework planning categories. While new sets of activities were reformulated, it is not clear why expected outputs and indicators were not defined at the same time. Although the revised logframe had reportedly included most of the activities planned in the original project, the evaluator did not find relevant to use the original list of outputs as a valid guide for this assessment.

While the project progress report for 2005 stated that “*The updated logframe (...) will include performance indicators for each site as well as for each landscape*” and that “*This new logframe will be submitted to UNFIP before next year’s annual report*”, there is **still no finalized CAWHFI logframe**. The CAWHFI project coordinator at WHC is conscious of this situation and has tried to get the input from the members of the Steering Committee in order to complete the revised logframe with indicators of performance and means of verification at landscape level. Despite the fact that this request was made in 2006 and that this was a requirement not only in the project document (pt. 3.6) but also in individual NGO contracts (art. I.2), a consolidated logframe has yet to be produced and validated. This situation means that the Steering Committee has currently no structured tool to properly monitor CAWHFI progress towards internally agreed outputs. *This also means that this evaluation did not benefit from a full logical framework as a guide and a reference for the*

*various assessments requested.* The completion and validation of a final project logical framework, including expected project outputs and performance indicators, is seen as a priority.

#### **C.4 Assessment of the planned project activities**

Under **Objective 1**, the formulation of activities encompasses a wide range of interventions which, in the logical framework, are listed as:

- 1.1.1. Recruit, train and equip additional ecoguards*
- 1.1.2. Provide adequate equipment and training to the existing PA staff*
- 1.1.3. Support regular patrols of ecoguards in PAs and joint transborder operations within the forest landscape.*
  - 1.2.1. Create additional outposts (posts, watchtowers, research & patrol posts) and staff housing at the base camp*
  - 1.2.2. Provide adequate transport (terrestrial & fluvial) and communication means*
  - 1.2.3. Support maintenance of the site's infrastructure*
    - 1.3.1. Develop and implement monitoring systems and PA surveillance schemes*
    - 1.3.2. Develop a regional bushmeat trade monitoring system*
    - 1.3.3. Organize aerial surveillance*

Most of these activities correspond to very basic management aspects of PAs for which implementing NGOs have often worked for many years with the funding from other donors. This aspect means that NGOs and local managers generally see **CAWHFI as an impersonal source of funding** that conveniently provides additional support to essential parks operation, but which is not linked to UNF or any of the donors, but the operating NGO. The identification of CAWHFI is thus only clear when the project fully covers the salaries of certain ecoguards, the purchase of a vehicle or the building of an outpost. The contribution of the project for the many general operations that are also funded by other (often more important) sources, is not recognized as such. As long as CAWHFI, as an alliance, does not need local visibility, this aspect is not important.

Here again, the relative vagueness of the activities formulation allows the NGOs and parks managers enough latitude to select the most relevant actions in their annual work plans. By providing sites with the means to ensure basic operations, it certainly means that CAWHFI helps improve the park's management. However, it does not imply that CAWHFI provides, as it is currently formulated, those sites with *adequate* staffing, training, equipment, transport or communications means<sup>3</sup>. Even if CAWHFI contribution is part of a much more important budget for such activities, it covers very basic means to run the sites. Since most of the planned activities are routine operations that must be part of any park's yearly work plan, one could wonder how and when these activities will be funded at an adequate level without the project. This raises the whole question of sustainability of CAWHFI and the need to set in motion sustainable funding mechanisms for the continued financing of such vital activities.

In the planned time span of the project, a large number of achievements can be expected in terms of staff hired and trained, number of patrols made, amount of equipments provided, constructions built, etc. But, in order to reach the duration of 4 years, the list of activities should have also included several training activities directly aimed at building the local capacity "to enable site management to design, adopt and operate effective law enforcement

---

<sup>3</sup> This unfortunate wording implies that the project will provide resources that are "*sufficient for the requirement*", which in any case could not be evaluated as satisfactory.

regime”. This aspect is currently covered by activities 1.3.1 to 1.3.3. In reading the formulation of these activities, there seems to be both incoherence and inadequacy between the intended output and the supporting activities. Activity 1.3.2 could have been integrated in Activity 2.4.5 (“Set up a wildlife management monitoring system in collaboration with all stakeholders”), and Activity 1.3.3, which is relevant only for the coastal zone of Gamba – Conkouati landscape, in Activity 1.3.1.

Under **Objective 3**, the activities are formulated as:

- 3.1.1 The Steering Committee submits CAWHFI’s annual progress reports to the World Heritage Committee meetings*
- 3.1.2 Assist Yaoundé countries to prepare request for assistance from WH Fund support for the development of national tentative lists of WH sites*
- 3.1.3 Organize 3 national studies on PAs adequacy with criteria and conditions for WH listing as well as regional meetings for the preparation of harmonized submissions of new forest sites to WH List by Yaoundé countries*
- 3.2.1 Work out collaborative arrangements on roles and responsibilities of each partner (CAWHFI Steering Committee)*
- 3.2.2 Test and develop CAWHFI coordination mechanism as a model for similar UN-conservation NGO partnerships*
- 3.3.1 NGOs and UNF develop and finalize their co-funding arrangements*
- 3.3.2 Attract additional donors and finalize new funding arrangements*
- 3.3.3 Support CAWHFI partners with design and development of site-based Trust Funds.*

This set of activities is also quite clear and allow for a precise evaluation of their progress. The first three address the commitments of the project to attract international attention and support for the preparation of harmonized submissions by “Yaoundé countries” of new sites to the World Heritage List. It is interesting to note that this activity is not only addressed to the 4 CAWHFI countries, but more widely to the 7 Yaoundé countries, adding Chad, DRC, and Equatorial Guinea. This supposes that CAWHFI should, before the end of this phase, also look at the situation and opportunities in these 3 other countries. Under Activity 3.1.3, the number of expected national studies should be 4, if CAWHFI intends to help all 4 CAWHFI countries to verify the adequacy of their PAs with World Heritage criteria and conditions.

Activities 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.3.1 demonstrate that the project management structure, its coordination mechanism, and the co-funding arrangements are of an experimental nature. The lessons learnt from the project should help the CAWHFI alliance to fine-tune the modalities of their partnership in view of delivering better conservation results. The present evaluation contributes to this learning exercise.

The last 2 activities demonstrate that partners are conscious of the fragility of their initiative if some more solid and sustainable financial basis is not constituted during this project phase. It is somehow strange that private investors from the tourism sector had not been referred to in this section as possible partners bringing a potential for developing a sustainable funding mechanism. The only reference to participation of ecotourism professionals is found under Objective 2 in activity 2.4.8 “*Develop alternative income generating activities in collaboration with the private sector (tourism, fisheries, agriculture and agroforestry, meat supply for forest concessions workers, etc.)*”. Indeed, in two year’s time, the selected landscapes will still need significant support for most of the issues addressed by Objectives 1 and 2, and it is not expected that the national administrations or some new transboundary structure will be able to take them over without a solid financial basis.

## C.5 Assessment of the project's internal management structure

In the project document, the management structure of CAWHFI is defined under the following categories:

- Management project budget and financial flows
- Coordination of the Initiative
- Responsibilities of the Steering Committee
- Responsibilities in the field
- Contribution from local governments
- Communication and public affairs
- Monitoring and evaluation

The project document explicitly acknowledges the complexity in the management structure that is induced by the large number of partners, their different natures and location, and the respective procedures and roles of UNF and UN agencies that have to be implemented in this alliance. The details of some of these aspects are included in the UN/NGOs contracts, of which the project document forms an annex. A full communication on - and acceptance of this complexity was thus ensured from the start of the project.

In terms of **managing of project budget and financial flows**, the detailed structure, mechanism, and disbursement channels are described in section 3.2.2., listed in UN-NGOs contracts (Art. II) and illustrated in Annex 7. The appropriateness of such complicated arrangement is questionable. In view of the flexibility needed in the approach of such important biodiversity conservation project in a difficult context, a thorough discussion on the possibility to adopt a less restrictive system should take place within the project's Steering Committee. In the context of other UNF/ UN/ NGOs projects for World Heritage, the justification of similar management procedures has already been discussed among partners and a very **loud call for simplification** has been made (UNF 2003, 2005).

In order to ensure an appropriate **coordination of the initiative**, CAWHFI partners agreed that a coordination system should be built at three levels: international, landscape and site; in the annexes of the project document, a diagram illustrates the type of coordination put in place, and a list of responsibilities of each partner is given. It was also agreed that the coordination of the overall Initiative would be mastered by a Steering Committee, and that UNESCO/WHC would have "*a special role as a facilitator of the complex coordination process*" and would appoint a programme officer to that effect. Each NGO would appoint a focal point for general CAWHFI communication, and together they would agree on one NGO leader per landscape.

At the time of developing the project concept, NGO partners did not feel the need to add an extra layer in the form of a regional coordinator, "*unless the coordinator's input adds to the existing efficiency of the NGOs' systems*". It was then felt that a coordination model where all partners are sharing the project responsibilities at the Steering Committee level and the zones level would bring them closer together and ensure an adequate cooperation and coordination model. The project document adds the precision that "*the proposed coordination structure is therefore a pilot model which, if successful, will constitute one significant output of this project*". Time did not allow to really testing this model, because the adjunction of the FFEM component in 2005 came with the appointment by UNESCO of an expert facilitator in 2006, who is also in charge of the regional coordination of the project.

In view of the complexity of the project coordination and the amount of site - and non-site based activities, the assessment of this evaluation is that there is a real need for a permanent

coordinator in the region. However, UNESCO and the Steering Committee should clarify, for the benefit of each partner, the respective roles of the WHC programme officer (Cédric Hance) and of the CAWHFI regional coordinator (Jean-Christophe Lefeuvre) in terms of their coordination duties. If the TOR of the latter has been circulated among partners, there is, surprisingly, no formal TOR for the former, which will make it difficult for UNESCO to evaluate his personal performances.

The **responsibilities of the Steering Committee and of the NGOs in the field** are very precisely described in the project document. The mandate given to the Steering Committee is broad and extremely important. At the conception stage, the project had planned that “*the Chairmanship of the Steering Committee will be given to each CAWHFI partner on a rotational basis for a 12 month period. During this period, the Chair together with the UNESCO/WHC programme officer will ensure the coordination of responsibilities (...)*”. Unfortunately, no Chairperson has been selected over the first 2 years, which means that the full responsibility of the overall coordination fell on the WHC programme officer’s shoulders, who is the only person – together with the regional coordinator since February 2007 – whose entire time is allocated to CAWHFI. Even if these 2 persons seem to properly coordinate their respective interventions, it does not seem healthy for a multi-stakeholders alliance to have no consistent presence of other members - especially of NGOs - to share these coordination responsibilities.

The contributions expected from **local governments** to the management structure were not precisely defined in the project concept. However, as far as their participation to the project is concerned, the following commitments were made by the national administrations:

- the national Wildlife Directors will participate as members of the Steering Committee (and “*a close cooperation with the development of RAPAC could therefore be envisaged*”);
- the contribution of their site managers in landscape coordination was assured, which would help develop harmonized management plans as requested by COMIFAC’s *Plan de Convergence*;
- the Wildlife Directors stated their commitments to not decrease the operational budgets for law enforcement in the PAs of the three CAWHFI landscapes;
- they stated their willingness to work on specific weaknesses identified during the project planning phase;
- they expressed their wish that the project would contribute to their own efforts to make their government more conscious, to heighten judicial authorities awareness, and to strictly enforce the existing legislation.

Given the relative lack of ownership of this project demonstrated by central administration authorities, and reported by sites managers and NGOs, this evaluation recommends to strengthen the linkages between CAWHFI and those administrations. This effort has already been started by the CAWHFI regional coordinator.

**Communication and public affairs:** among CAWHFI Steering Committee members, it was agreed that UNESCO/ WHC would take the lead in developing a draft joint communication strategy linked with the fund raising strategy. The CAWHFI partners agreed that they would not promote a distinct identity for CAWHFI, but that they would instead build a common communication strategy around the World Heritage in the region. The project would not create its own communication channels but partners agreed to make their existing media and high level spokespersons available for that joint purpose. The day to day management of communication has not been specifically attributed to any organization or individual, but is



taken partly by WHC and partly by the regional CAWHFI coordinator. When finalizing the communication strategy, the Steering Committee should also clarify this aspect.

The project Steering Committee was mandated to ensure the global management of **monitoring and evaluation**. It was planned that during each Steering Committee meeting, “*a specific session will be allocated to reviewing the progress of all activities planned for the period considered*”. FAO was mandated to explore linkages between CAWHFI and FAO technical programmes and to organise, in consultation with SC members, an appropriate project monitoring mechanism; these activities have not taken place yet. FAO was in charge of organizing the formal mid-term and final evaluations at the end of Year 2 and 4. Linkages with the *Enhancing our Heritage* project was foreseen, but this has unfortunately not happened yet. Finally, exchange of lessons learnt was also planned with the UNF/ UNESCO/ DRC project team, but this project came to an end in 2004 while CAWHFI was starting.

## C.6 Risks and assumptions

Neither the project document, nor its logical framework list specific risks or assumptions linked to the implementation of CAWHFI. However, some of the most obvious can be inferred from the formulation of activities in the logical framework. The following list, however, is compiled by the evaluator; ideally, it should have been built in a participatory manner by all project stakeholders at the planning stage.

Among the important **risks** we can point out:

- NGOs pulling out of the alliance: as CAWHFI experienced with JGI, there is a risk that other NGOs might withdraw for being unable to raise the necessary matching funds *or* to secure funding from “acceptable” sources (i.e. third parties accepting that their contribution be transferred through UNF books). This in turn could put at risk the availability of funding for the current 4 year phase.
- UNF modifying its Biodiversity Program priorities: while UNF’s Biodiversity Program Framework had clear strategic priorities on promoting initiatives designed to strengthen World Heritage, there is a risk that the Foundation’s priorities may shift to other issues, thereby threatening continued co-funding arrangements and the whole financial sustainability of CAWHFI beyond the first phase.
- Insufficient priority given by governments to PAs conservation: as protected areas will not significantly contribute to the countries’ economic development, the risk is significant to witness an increasing lack of support to law enforcement, lack of implementation of Yaoundé commitments, and lack of interest in World Heritage issues from the governments and their administration.

Among major **assumptions**, we can list:

- Governments keep their budget for PAs operations at same level;
- Neighbouring Yaoundé countries conserve their willingness to work together;
- Local/regional authorities and administrations accept to cooperate with PA managers;
- Local communities and other stakeholders are willing to collaborate with park staff;
- CAWHFI’s management and coordination is effective at all levels;
- UNF and NGOs find a satisfactory agreement on co-funding arrangements;
- Funding is secured for the development of a full 10 Y project;
- Other major projects keep their support in the 3 selected ecological landscapes.

As we can see, the list of risks and assumptions is substantial. Some of the risks are real and could seriously derail the project process. Similarly, some of the assumptions could be qualified as “killing assumptions” if the worse scenario does happen. CAWHFI’s Steering Committee is the project management structure that is mandated to monitor these risks and possibly take pre-emptive or corrective measures.

### **C.7 Institutional setting and external linkages**

The institutional setting of CAWHFI should be assessed at three different levels: international, regional and national.

At **international level**, the project rationale has a very strong linkage with the commitment of the 4 beneficiary countries as signatories to the World Heritage Convention. In this regard, CAWHFI partners – under Objective 3 – are developing specific contacts with government authorities, national UNESCO Committee, and/or regional and national UNESCO representations in order to promote and support this commitment. The leading role of UNESCO/WHC in Paris is of particular importance in terms of maintaining contacts with national ambassadors and with UNESCO representations in Central Africa, as well as with other departments (MAB) and with the World Heritage Committee.

To a lesser degree, the positioning of the project also contributes to help countries to fulfilling their commitments under other international agreements like CBD or CITES (i.a. via the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group), as well as implementing important recommendations on protected areas issued by international fora like UN/ Millenium Development Goals, IUCN/ WPC, or CBD/PoWPA. Related to this last Decision (CBD 2004), it is significant to note that all the major international conservation NGOs have publicly committed their support to integrate in their respective programmes a consolidated support to both the conservation of World Heritage sites and the implementation of PoWPA (Anon 2006). The absence of explicit linkage between CAWHFI activities and those important international frameworks is presumably due to their simultaneous development.

At **regional level**, the main institutional linkage of CAWHFI is with the COMIFAC, a Commission specifically created to drive the implementation of the Yaoundé Declaration through the *Plan de Convergence*. Since RAPAC has been mandated by the COMIFAC to drive all aspects dealing with biodiversity conservation and PAs development in this Plan, CAWHFI’s institutional linkages with RAPAC have yet to be considerably strengthened. The context for this is favourable since CAWHFI regional coordinator shares offices with RAPAC Executive Secretariat in Libreville, and agreements on communication exchange between both have already been made. Since the role of RAPAC in terms of centralizing and managing information on PAs has recently been agreed with FORAF, a mechanism of systematic transmission of standardized data from CAWHFI sites has yet to be put in place.

As UNESCO, FAO, UE (ECOFAC), JGI, WCS and WWF are all formal CBFP partners (PFBC 2006), the institutional setting of CAWHFI also places the project very close to this other partnership created to support the commitments of Yaoundé countries. The absence of ECOFAC during the first 2 years of CAWHFI operations has prevented the development of strong linkages in particular in support to two TRIDOM sites: Dja FR and Odzala NP. With the restarting of ECOFAC Phase IV in June 2007, and with ECOFAC presence in CAWHFI Steering Committee, these linkages will undoubtedly be reinforced. As previously mentioned, CAWHFI and CARPE share their support to the 3 selected landscapes; although no formal

linkage has been developed between both projects, the involvement of WCS and WWF in both ensures in theory an adequate synergy.

At the **national level**, CAWHFI is linked, as any other similar project, with the local forest and environment ministry and with its wildlife and parks administration. In some case, CAWHFI is considered as part of a national project for which the Ministry dispatches a national project director in the field (i.e. CAR: Projet Dzanga-Sangha, to which a GTZ project is also contributing). In other countries (i.e. Gabon, Cameroon), the project is represented in the main national coordination forum through the participation of NGO partners.

A report from WCS and WWF to the CAWHFI Steering Committee on the evolution and the potential of these national and regional coordination with other projects has still to be made.

## V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management

Much of the information that substantiates the following analysis can be found in the progress and financial reports produced by the partners. Some information extracted from those reports is mentioned here only when a specific example illustrates an aspect of this assessment.

### A. Project Budget and Expenditure

CAWHFI budget is comparatively important in terms of input into a biodiversity conservation project in the Congo Basin. However, spread annually among 12 protected areas in 3 transboundary landscapes of 4 countries, its annual amount per site is somehow limited with regards to covering the multiple needs addressed in the objectives. This is partly why the project insisted on a proper integration and synergy of inputs with others.

CAWHFI has experienced **many delays** since the start of the project. Several years have passed between the project finalization workshop (February 2002), the signature of the project by UNF (May 2003) and the signature of the contracts for Year 1 by WWF (June 2004), WCS (November 2004), and CTC (February 2005). Further delays in the rate of delivery of project inputs were recorded in Year 1 and 2, mainly due to the complex and restrictive administrative mechanisms seemingly applicable between UNF, UN agencies and NGOs (cf. section C.5 above). Since the beginning of the project, the experience has shown how consecutive difficulties could have added up along the long chain (Annex 7) of contracting partners and caused delays in disbursement and concrete field action. Since the list of sequential requirements is quite long and the risk of slow administrative processing is high, it is not surprising that various setbacks have caused these delays.

CAWHFI's original budget of 2004 amounted to US\$ 6,787,360; after a downsizing of CI and JGI parallel funds, the **current total budget amounts to US\$ 6,743,183**.

The theoretical expenditures planned in 2004 for the first 2 years amounted to US\$ 4,061,320, but the readjustments of CI and JGI budgets brought it down to US\$ 3,359,575.

**At the end of 2007, the funds effectively disbursed or engaged** by CAWHFI partners (contracts, matching funds, parallel funds, overheads, missions) **amounted to US\$ 3,002,930** (UNESCO: \$ 1,191,161; FAO: \$ 410,035; WWF: \$ 894,086; WCS: \$ 507,648).

Compared to CAWHFI planned budget, there is thus a **10.5 % under-spending** that seems to be attributable to the following main factors:

- multiple administrative delays;
- difficulties for the NGOs to secure their amounts of “3<sup>rd</sup> party matching funds”;
- late start in implementing the re-programmed “JGI component”;
- difficulties related to the implementation of joint activities under the CI/CTC component;
- confusion between yearly contractual cycle and calendar year (CAWHFI is closing its Year 2 in December 2007 while the project officially started in 2004).

The real impact of these administrative hurdles and delays in delivering conservation action in CAWHFI sites have not been precisely assessed, but in some cases they are significant. When a transfer of funds is delayed (whatever be the cause), NGOs in the field have to cope with

payments that must be made on a regular basis, like salaries or patrol costs. These unplanned disbursements have to be advanced from other sources, and there is no guarantee that they could be refunded in time for that reporting cycle. Often caught in a dilemma, NGO have very little choice but to take financial risks in the hope that the expected transfer would be made soon.

The efficiency of the system could certainly be higher if partners would agree on simplifying their procedures, as was already agreed by UNF and UN agencies (UNF 2003). The efficiency of the current system could only be based on the correct planning and timely action needed to trigger decision at each level. A specific discussion on this aspect at the Steering Committee level would be advisable.

In some cases where pressures on PAs are high, delayed disbursements may have had some impact on the integrity of the sites, like in the case of Conkouati where hiring and dispatching of turtle monitoring teams could not be made in time for nesting season, allowing for a level of poaching that could have been avoided. When funds for monthly ecoguards salaries and regular patrols cannot be secured in time, the risk of experiencing cases of illegal hunting is reportedly much higher.

According to both NGO partners and national site managers, once transfers have been made, the rate of delivery is usually good and disbursements are made according to the work plan. In all sites, funds have been used for planned activities (or alternative activities following acceptance from UNESCO). However, in one particular case, implementing NGO used CAWHFI funds for activities that were not planned in the project (WCS used 37.000 USD for studies related to nomination of Lopé NP on World heritage List); an arrangement with UNESCO has now been agreed to refund this amount.

In all 4 countries, the governments' contribution is very small compared to the needs of the sites. According to wardens, the level of those contributions seems to have remained stable or have slightly increased.

## **B. Activities and Outputs**

Before proceeding to a systematic comparison of actual project activities and outputs with those foreseen in original project document and subsequent work plans, the evaluator wishes to recall here that his analysis is based on the visits of only 5 out of 12 sites, on interviews with a sample of the project partners and on the reading of a limited number of work plans and progress reports ([Annex 3](#)). This analysis therefore cannot deal with the detail of all the activities undertaken in CAWHFI sites.

The structure of this assessment follows that of the project logframe.

### **1. Improve the management of selected protected areas of potential outstanding universal value :**

*1.1. Provide the protected areas with adequate staffing:* together with its national partner, the project has recruited, trained and equipped nearly 200 new ecoguards. This in itself is a significant input of CAWHFI in terms of institutional support to the national parks administration, to the level of employment, and to the local economy. All these ecoguards have received basic equipment (uniforms, boots, tents, field gear, etc.) that

allows them to go on surveillance patrols on a regular basis. All of them have also received specific training made of a paramilitary component (often given by professional trainers of national gendarmerie or army) and of a technical component (provided by project staff). In most of the sites, CAWHFI also contributed to renewing the field equipment of existing PAs staff, but significant needs still exist in some parks, like in Dzanga Sangha. Training sessions to enhance the professionalism of field staff have been organized in all sites; both CAWHFI ecoguards and other categories of staff have benefited from these sessions, but not necessarily at the same time. When their younger colleagues have just been trained, some older ecoguards therefore feel less technically fit and have expressed the need for refreshing sessions. Regular surveillance and law enforcement patrols have been supported by the project in all sites; this has allowed a much higher presence of park staff in the field, and the surveillance of a much wider proportion of the site. Joint transborder operations have been organized occasionally in the form of bi- or tri-national patrols. These have strengthened the relationships between contiguous PAs and stimulated positive contacts and emulation among field staff.

- 1.2. *Improve the park's management infrastructure and equipment:* under this set of activities, CAWHFI has created in various sites several new buildings like additional outposts, patrol posts, research camps, housing for staff, etc. Other types of lighter infrastructure include turtle monitoring camps, jetty, staff meeting- and resting place, etc. In terms of equipment, the project has allowed the acquisition of a series of key management assets like vehicles, motorcycles, dugout canoes, outboard engines, GPS, compasses, maps, handheld radios, laptops, printers, etc. A significant portion of the funding also went to fuel, maintenance and other operating costs which allowed the sites to maintain their infrastructure in a good condition, and to ensure appropriate terrestrial, fluvial and marine transports. On a yearly basis, the choice of these various inputs were adapted to the most pressing needs of each site, and were selected jointly by project staff and site managers. In some cases, under evaluated costs have prevented the acquisition of equipment or the building of infrastructure (like the radar and watchtower planned for Conkouati). These assets have contributed very significantly to the conservation of these sites, to the morale, image and credibility of national staff, and to avoiding continued increasing pressure on the sites' natural resources. This is a major outcome of the project.
- 1.3. *Build capacity to enable site-management to design, adopt and operate effective law enforcement regimes:* the activities planned under this category involved the development and implementation of monitoring systems and PAs surveillance schemes, the development of a regional bushmeat trade monitoring system, and the organization of aerial surveillance. This last activity relates to the monitoring of turtle nesting beaches in the Gamba-Mayumba-Conkouati landscape. Funding for aerial surveillance and for turtle nests inventory flights in Gabon has apparently been secured from other sources (USFWS) than CAWHFI. The development of "a regional bushmeat trade monitoring system" is an activity that has not yet been undertaken as such. Each NGO/site is collecting data on bushmeat trade with its own methodology, and the results of these data are not, therefore, readily comparable. The harmonization of the data collection is a need that was identified at CAWHFI development stage, and which justified this particular activity. It is hoped that some concerted effort in that direction be deployed in parallel with CAWHFI Activity 2.4.1 "*Develop, in collaboration with all stakeholders, a monitoring system that ensures correct implementation of the conventions and management plans*". In each site, NGO partners and national managers have developed their own surveillance scheme and monitoring methodology. So far, no single harmonized ecological- or law enforcement monitoring system has been

established and accepted by all sites (except for monitoring of baobabs in the TNS). This necessary harmonization, however, is clearly mentioned among the “*axes stratégiques du Plan de Convergence de la COMIFAC*” (COMIFAC 2005). It is RAPAC and FORAF’s intention to work soon with all partners in the region towards an integrated information management system. It is expected that CAWHFI partners, in the context of their future collaboration with RAPAC, take an active role in this exercise. In order to reach the planned output, CAWHFI should put much more effort in the training of senior park staff in the field of management planning. This particular output is, in the evaluator’s view, the most important in order to reach CAWHFI’s Overall Objective and its Objective 1. In the current situation, in all sites, the project staff has a tendency to focus this CAWHFI capacity building component on junior park staff and on project staff. There doesn’t seem to be a clear strategy to provide formal and non formal training to wardens with the view to build, as quickly as possible, their capacity to “design, adopt and operate” management plans of various natures. As long as this concern is not at the centre of conservation projects objectives, the management of PAs in Central Africa will not be sustainable as they will continue to be totally dependent of NGO expertise.

Although CAWHFI Objective 2 is nearly entirely the subject of the FFEM component, some activities have been partly funded by the UNF component:

**2. *Improve natural resource management, particularly wildlife, in the forest landscape around selected protected areas of outstanding universal value:***

Under this objective, park and project staffs have been actively involved in working towards output 2.2 “*Raise all stakeholders’ awareness (government, private sector and local population) on the importance of sustainable wildlife management and on the role they can play in combating illegal hunting*”. The efforts to raise local authorities’ awareness were done through the organization of workshops on forest and wildlife conservation laws and regulations (Act. 2.2.2), and by facilitating the support from - and collaboration with local police forces (Act. 2.2.3). Awareness raising workshops were organized in the neighboring administrative zones of all CAWHFI sites. According to both project and parks staff, these workshops play a key role in attracting understanding, sympathy and support from key influential people. A large number of magistrates and other judicial staff have attended these workshops and, as a consequence, the interaction between local park management and those administrations has considerably improved. In many documented cases, unlike previous instances, the fines and sentences inflicted for poaching have now been given in accordance with the legislation and in full consideration of the seriousness of the infraction. Given the importance of law enforcement in the context of sustainable conservation of CAWHFI sites, it would be advisable to include the organization of these workshops as regular, and not occasional, project activities.

The collaboration between parks and local police/ gendarmerie forces varies from a site to another. The quality of the support that a site manager can hope from them depends essentially from the quality of the local commander. In fact, all sites have experienced both good and bad collaborations, and they have little choice but to hope that the police forces hierarchy will appoint a good man. This is an important aspect, particularly when local circumstances force park staff to organize joint operations (anti poaching patrols, road blocks) with police forces. The quality of overall collaboration between site managers and those authorities will therefore depend greatly on the success with which wardens will manage their relations with other locally important people on which they have no authority.

### **3. Use World Heritage status to improve protected area management and long term conservation financing**

As mentioned earlier, it is this particular objective that gives CAWHFI its specific identity. The project had planned to focus its efforts in three different areas:

- 3.1. *Use annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee as a forum to report on CAWHFI achievements and call for an international and African political commitment to the adoption and realization of Yaoundé Summit principles and other such subregional and regional (African) instruments:* the CAWHFI annual progress reports compiled by WHC have been submitted to the 30<sup>th</sup> (Vilnius) and 31<sup>st</sup> (Christchurch) sessions of the WH Committee for consideration. The various communications within and outside the UNESCO network has allowed to raise awareness among other Parties to the Convention, and this has facilitated approaching Party States (like Belgium) and donors (like FFEM) and obtaining their support and participation to the project. During the first 2 years of project activity, there has not been a specific use of the project existence and of its justification to support Yaoundé principles to exert a specific diplomatic lobbying on Party States or national companies in view of solving problems affecting the sites integrity. However, in view of the number of instances of such threats, this will need to be increasingly considered by UNESCO as an urgent contribution to the success of CAWHFI. The project organized different meetings in order to assist the countries to prepare requests for assistance from the WH Fund for the development of national tentative lists of WH sites. This has led to the publication of national Tentative Lists by all 4 countries. The fact that not all CAWHFI sites are included in these lists is a clear manifestation of the countries reluctance to include PAs whose limits or regulations may be changed in view of the future exploitation of some of their natural resources. It is, however, a very valid process not only as a necessary learning step but also as an indispensable stepping stone prior to the official submission of a new site or group of sites. Further efforts in that direction are planned by the project in the coming months. Indeed, CAWHFI will organize a gap analysis workshop, which will be followed by national studies on PAs adequacy with criteria and conditions for WH listing. The intention is to be able to organize, in Year 3 or 4 of the project, a regional meeting for the preparation of the harmonized submission of the TNS to WH List by the 3 concerned countries. In order to reach this stage, it seems obvious that extensive efforts in terms of communication and advocacy will be necessary to convince the 4 countries of the importance and interest of such approach.
- 3.2. *Build UN – conservation NGO partnerships and encourage working arrangements to promote World Heritage status to a selected number of Central African protected area complexes for the conservation of biodiversity:* it is interesting to see such an output for activities aiming at “using the World Heritage status to improve biodiversity conservation and protected area management”, because it clearly confirms the concept that reaching this objective will depend a great deal on the strength of the CAWHFI alliance. Based on NGOs declared interest and support for this approach (i.a. Anon 2006), UNF and UN agencies are determined to make this partnership a success, and therefore to work out collaborative arrangements on the roles and responsibilities of each partner that would ensure the most effective and efficient cooperation. To that effect, the project has planned to “test and develop CAWHFI coordination mechanism as a model for similar UN-conservation NGO partnerships”. After 2 years of functioning, CAWHFI partners have a lot to discuss in terms of lessons learnt and avenues for improvement. The function and the mandate of the CAWHFI Steering Committee are extremely important in this regard, but this forum has apparently not



been used yet to assess and improve the existing collaborative system. As mentioned above, UNF, UN agencies and NGOs have already discussed various aspects of their partnerships, and conclusions and recommendations have been drawn (UNF 2003, 2005); these could be a valid basis for this future exercise.

- 3.3. *Ensure financing of CAWHFI during the 4-year period and explore possibilities for long term financing of Central African biodiversity conservation through innovative arrangements between UNF, conservation NGOs and other potential donors:* activities planned towards this output included first the development and finalization of the UNF - NGOs co-funding arrangements. Related to the point above and with the difficulties experienced by JGI and WCS since the beginning of the project, this aspect takes a particularly important dimension in the context of building a solid, sustainable and successful partnership. So far, as the adjunction of the FFEM showed, the project has been quite successful in terms of attracting additional donors and finalizing new funding arrangements. The CAWHFI partners have also been very active in contributing to the development of the TNS Foundation and trust fund, and this will be very instrumental when the future nomination of the whole cluster of PAs in that landscape will be considered by the World heritage Committee. Recently, another major fundraising effort has been deployed by UNESCO and WWF in order to secure additional funding from the European Commission; the EC should make its decision known in the very near future. FAO is also exploring the possibility of additional funding from GEF. In view of the need to ensure the project financial sustainability, it is planned that a consolidated effort by CAWHFI partners would be developed during Years 3 and 4 with feasibility studies, the design and the possible development of site-based Trust Funds.

### **C. Government Support**

It is widely acknowledged that the support from the governments to CAWHFI is limited. Numerous examples experienced by CAWHFI partners demonstrate the serious limitations in the governments' willingness to get their international commitments implemented, or their national legislation strictly enforced. The most recent report of CAWHFI Steering Committee meeting (CAWHFI 2007b) reviews the many constraints on the conservation of the sites that are linked to poor governance. Although several of these aspects can be tackled by the project, most of them are a matter for higher level intervention. CBFP and COMIFAC would be the most relevant points of entry to discuss this. The most significant practical support is that the level of budget and manpower allocated by relevant ministries via their central administrations to CAWHFI sites has remained the same or, in some cases where CAWHFI-funded ecoguards were incorporated in the administration staff, increased slightly. Getting access to that budget, however, is not always automatic and may request active lobbying from the wardens, as it is the case in Conkouati.

From all 5 sites visited and interviews with project and national parks staff, there was an unequivocal opinion that **central administrations do not demonstrate sufficient interest** in this project (and others). Visits from central administration representatives remain exceptional and only occur when higher level authorities or visiting personalities are coming to the place. Even when an invitation to visit is issued with the mission costs fully covered, they are usually turned down. Comments from national Wildlife Departments on sites or project progress reports, on draft management plans, or replies to specific request for intervention by wardens or NGOs are also exceptional.

In some cases, central administrations have admonished the wardens of CAWHFI sites for having organized particularly successful seizures of bushmeat, ivory or firearms. Arrests of influential poachers or local personalities were often met by decisions from above, which were inconsistent with the law and opposed to the work of park managers. In these extreme cases, not only sites are hardly helped by their administration, but their managers are punished for doing a good job of enforcing the law. These aspects, related to general principles and practices of poor governance of PAs in the Congo Basin, have been analysed in details by Nguingiri (2004). They send obviously very confusing and frustrating signals to field staff, and constitute a serious constraint to the success of CAWHFI.

One particular obstacle experienced in many sites is the rapid **turn over of senior staff**. Wardens are regularly transferred to other sites without consultation with project staff, and their transfer is usually so hasty that no proper handing over could be made with their successor. The frustration of NGOs, who have invested in building constructive relationship with a warden, is understandable when he is transferred before even being able to fully understand the local situation or apply new jointly agreed strategies. This fact is often invoked by NGOs for not investing more in training of wardens. Although this is a sensitive issue, a closer interaction between NGOs and central administrations could perhaps alleviate some of these difficulties. A specific discussion on this could also be held in the context of a Steering Committee meeting or a RAPAC meeting.

The really substantial involvement of national administration in CAWHFI comes from the site based staff. In most cases, the dynamics between national staff and project staff are good, but this evaluation felt, as explained below, that not enough responsibilities in running the project were given so far to park staff.

#### **D. Project Management**

The management of such a complex project must be considered at different levels. The three most important levels are: the UN agencies, the NGOs, and the project Steering Committee.

At the **level of the UN agencies**, the important managerial role taken by **UNESCO/WHC** has justified the progressive posting of two permanent CAWHFI staff: a project officer, hired in 2005 with funding from Belgium and based at WHC in Paris, and a regional coordinator, hired in 2007 with FFEM funding, and based in Libreville. Although UNESCO did not give him formal TOR, the main responsibilities of the first person include contracts management, reporting and relations with donors, coordination with FAO, and preparation of a new project phase. The responsibilities of the regional coordinator include technical advice (especially for the FFEM component), the monitoring of field activities, the relationships with national administrations and regional institutions and structures, and overall regional visibility of the Initiative. The roles of these 2 persons are very complementary and they have developed a good coordination mechanism among themselves. Given the complexity of managing such a multi-donors, multi-stakeholders project, its management structure could not have remained (as in Year 1) without permanent staff, and the current structure, with a tandem of persons in charge of coordinating the administration and the technical development, is ideal. After more than 2 years of managing this project and facilitating its coordination, a number of decisions could easily be made to simplify internal procedures, for example in simplifying and harmonizing the reporting formats.

However, NGOs claim that the respective roles and responsibilities of both coordinators have not been discussed or communicated among partners. As a consequence, the interaction expected between NGOs and them remains unclear. Requests for information, instructions concerning the technical content of NGOs reports, and communications with site wardens were sent by the WHC programme officer and have reportedly added to the confusion. This evaluation considers that **the availability of these 2 resource persons is a strength of this project**. However, **a clearer apportionment of their tasks**, discussed and agreed among partners at the Steering Committee, would confer a greater efficiency and effectiveness to their work, and it would generate a genuine ownership of their function to all partners.

The management function that **FAO** was committed to was not properly implemented. All partners reported that there was no active involvement in the project by the first officer in charge, but this has changed in 2007 with the appointment of a new one. The responsibilities of managing WCS contract by FAO suffered from this, and many delays and miscommunication between WCS and the FAO Regional Office in Accra have caused a lot of frustration. It is likely that a transfer of administrative responsibility will be operated in the near future and that the FAO Libreville Office could take a much more active role, which could considerably ease the situation. This, however, raises the question as to whether both WWF and WCS contracts (which are identical in substance) would not be more efficiently handled by the same programme officer in UNESCO. FAO could then concentrate its input in the project on issues that are closer to its expertise, like the development of a positive interface between the conservation of PAs and the sustainable exploitation of contiguous forest concessions. With the recent appointment of a very knowledgeable Forest Officer at the FAO Libreville Office, it is expected that technical support to CAWHFI will significantly increase.

The management of the CAWHFI project by **NGOs** has to be considered from different points of view. A first aspect is the fact that the NGO representatives who are involved in the management of the project are based either in their HQ (US, Switzerland), in regional offices (London, Yaoundé), in country offices (Brazzaville, Libreville, Yaoundé, Bangui), in zonal office (Yokadouma), or in the sites. Without a very good internal communication - and decision making system, this dispersion is prone to generate various constraints to the project management. By contract, each NGO should have designated a “coordinator” among its staff, who should be the focal person liaising with the WH Centre and with the Chairman of the Steering Committee, coordinating the activities executed in their different programme sites, and ensuring timely execution and reporting. Contrary to UNESCO/WHC, the NGOs coordinators’ time is only marginally devoted to CAWHFI as their responsibilities cover many other projects and sites. The managerial responsibility is in fact spread among a number of NGO people, and the coordination and consolidation of the activities in the sites are ensured by the NGO coordinator on a needs basis.

The dynamics, politics and procedures between the various NGO offices involved have sometimes been at the origin of slowness and delays in ordering equipment or in submitting technical and financial reports. Delays in the signature of new annual contract have been recorded, as UNESCO would not sign a contract before UNF funds have been transferred on their books. NGOs would therefore operate for extended periods without contract. Overall, this has not significantly impacted on the project implementation in the field because NGOs have some latitude in using funds from other sources. UN agencies reported several cases where financial reports submitted by NGOs were not submitted under the agreed format; and transfer of subsequent tranches of budget was therefore delayed until a correctly structured report was submitted.

The evaluation found that interactions between NGOs (particularly WWF) and CAWHFI coordinators were not positive enough to ensure an effective project implementation. NGOs complain about the load of questions, directives and changes in reporting format received. They claim that the amount of administrative work induced by the CAWHFI process is already extremely demanding, and is not justified with regard to the amounts of funding involved. From a NGO point of view, this situation is made worse by the fact that no project management cost can be built by NGOs in their CAWHFI budget. Contrary to the case of UN agencies, their whole administrative costs have to be borne from other sources.

The evaluation found however that in general, NGOs have a good capacity to manage projects and have developed very professional systems of financial control and monitoring. The checks and controls on vehicles use and running costs made by the evaluator in WWF Office in Yokadouma, for example were very convincing. In some other places, the supervision of staff (drivers) and assets (vehicles) was considered as insufficient. A case in point is the fate of a CAWHFI- funded vehicle in Dzanga Sangha that was destroyed in a road accident caused by the driver recklessness and the poor maintenance and supervision. This incident has not been mentioned in the site progress report.

Concerning the management of the project at the site level, the evaluation found that there is generally a good interaction between site-based project staff and national staff. In most cases, there is an adequate involvement of national senior staff in the annual project planning, but some wardens claim that there is insufficient clarity on financial aspects. For various reasons mentioned above, the NGOs have a tendency to control the management of nearly all aspects of the project, except the management of ecoguards and the organization of patrols; often NGOs claim that the information collected by patrols of ecoguards are not properly reported to project staff. Between PA managers and project staff, there is a correct supervision of implementation of all the other aspects.

According to the project document (pt. 3.3.2), the **Steering Committee** was mandated with various managerial responsibilities, and the specific role of each category of members is specified. Most of the responsibilities to drive the SC and organize its annual meetings have been taken by UNESCO/WHC as the main facilitator of the SC. On the basis of the SC meetings reports however, it seems that a number of commitments have not been followed up and that some responsibilities have not been properly undertaken according to its TOR. Indeed, the format planned for its meeting agenda has not been followed; no project monitoring system has been adopted; the efficiency of the internal coordinating mechanism has not been evaluated; an efficient coordination system between CAWHFI and other projects has not been discussed; the effective collaboration with national authorities have not been discussed either. The communication strategy – which was planned to be developed “*under the coordination of UNESCO/WHC and in full consultation with all NGO partners*” and submitted to the consideration of UNF and UNFIP “*before the end of the first 12 months of the project*” – has only been developed by WHC in 2007 and a draft strategy was been discussed with NGOs at the CAWHFI Technical meeting in March 2007. In terms of information management, the SC should also have ensured sufficient information sharing among project partners (including national administrations) on the basis of all the progress reports produced; these reports are currently not systematically distributed and could perhaps be posted on the UNESCO/ CAWHFI website. Despite the merit of those proposed measures, the nomination of an annually rotating Chairperson among CAWHFI partners, and the linkage of SC meetings with RAPAC meetings have not been followed. The evaluation recommends

that the SC consider taking advantage of the opportunities and the effectiveness attached to these provisions.

The SC meetings, however, are the only instances where partners from all 4 countries can meet and discuss of project issues. The value of this annual gathering is not questioned and the first 2 meetings have produced very interesting results and recommendations. The issue is how to make of such important meeting a tool effectively producing a level of auto-analysis that is required to really steer the project. It seems to the evaluator that, with the number of people attending (there were 61 participants at the 2<sup>d</sup> SC), it would be very difficult to discuss and make decisions in accordance with what is required by its TOR. It would be therefore advisable to reconsider the organization of this meeting and set up parallel sessions exclusively devoted to project monitoring, evaluation and orientation, as it was done with the Technical Meeting.

#### **E. Technical and Operational Backstopping**

There seems that no technical backstopping on issues related to strengthening PAs management quality were planned to be given to field sites. On this topic - which is at the core of the project's global objective - CAWHFI relies on NGOs extensive experience and expertise. In the field of World Heritage, however, there has been regular technical backstopping from UNESCO/WHC on various related issues. The level of this support has considerably increased with the fielding of the regional coordinator in early 2007, and his expertise is now available to NGOs (and to local UNESCO offices) in all 4 countries whenever needed.

As local governments are signatories of CBD and, as such, committed themselves to implement CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas (CBD 2004), it would make much sense to link NGOs work in support to CAWHFI sites with the PoWPA priorities. Partnerships between Governments and NGOs are encouraged by CBD in order to prepare for PoWPA planning and implementation (PoWPA 2007) and the potential role of NGOs partners in this regard is very much in line with CAWHFI's global objective. NGO staff in the field may not be aware of their HQ's commitment to link their involvement in World Heritage sites with their support to PoWPA (Anon 2006); in that case, some technical backstopping should be required from their HQ in order to implement this in the field. In addition, UNESCO/WHC should find an arrangement with IUCN/WCPA for technical support in the field of PAs management planning and management effectiveness monitoring. Various workshops and training have been organized by NGOs on these issues (like the WWF/RAPAC workshop on the use of PAMETT tool for rapid assessment of sites management effectiveness), but more systematic and global approaches (like the EoH methodology) will have to be introduced soon if the management of CAWHFI sites has eventually to "satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status".

Parallel to this, RAPAC is about to finalize a new strategic plan (2008-2017) that encompasses a large number of priorities related to improving the management of RAPAC's "Pilot Sites" (all CAWHFI sites also belong to RAPAC's list of Pilot Sites). In this context, there are obviously many aspects on which CAWHFI and RAPAC should work together, and an important role for NGOs and the regional coordinator in linking CAWHFI and RAPAC networks.

An important area for backstopping national field staff and partners NGOs is in terms of the high level contacts with governments and private sector representatives that are needed in order to discuss and mitigate the threats posed by extractive industries on all sites. These moves must be made by high level CAWHFI representatives as they cannot expose frontline staff. CAWHFI SC should play a key role in preparing the lobbying strategies and diplomatic approaches that are needed. For example, CAWHFI should approach Maurel & Prom, a French company responsible for causing serious damages in exploring Conkouati NP for oil (WCS 2005a, 2006b), with a specific (and possibly public) call to effectively implement their own corporate strategy. Indeed, this company web site<sup>4</sup> states the “implementation of a sustainable development strategy based on the social responsibility of the company” and the “active integration of social and ecological concerns to all its activities”. Many other companies operating next to CAWHFI sites also publicly advertise their environmental and social commitments as well as their adhesion to professional deontological charters.

In a related field, a concerted campaign should be organized by CAWHFI partners to obtain from mining companies to adhere to the commitments made by the member companies of the International Council on Mining and Metals to “*respect legally designated protected areas*” and to “*undertake not to explore or mine in World Heritage properties. All possible steps will be taken to ensure that existing operations in World Heritage properties as well as existing and future operations adjacent to World Heritage properties are not incompatible with the outstanding universal value for which these properties are listed and do not put the integrity of these properties at risk.*” (ICMM 2003).

As foreseen in CAWHFI project document, high level personalities from UNF, UN agencies, and NGOs could have a determinant role to play in this field, and these priority topics and targets for advocacy should be built in the project’s communication strategy.

## **VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness**

### **A. Effects and Impact**

As a consequence of the project’s inputs, the national PA administration is making extensive use of the ecoguards force, of the equipment and the infrastructure, in order to strengthen the protection of the sites. The training received by staff has been put to good use and has generated a sense of pride and, in many cases, the desire for more training. However, training PA staff has been restricted to mastering the basic field activities and the knowledge needed by ecoguards in the course of their work. This has significantly enhanced the sites protection capacity. In most cases, it has not involved the consistent training of *parks senior staff* for their management responsibilities. It has, however, included on-the-job specialized training for *NGOs project staff* in the field of management of ecotourism, ecological monitoring, administrative and financial management, or community conservation. Overall, the CAWHFI sites have therefore at their disposal a good range of expertises necessary to cope with most aspects of PA management.

The main output of the project so far has been to help to strengthen the protection of selected sites. Remarkable progress has been made since the beginning of the project in terms of

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.maureletprom.fr/spip.php?rubrique6>

enhancing ecoguards presence, coverage of sites under control, and dissuasion of illegal hunting and bushmeat trade. More globally, the effects of the project have led to a better recognition of the legal status of the sites, to a more efficient protection system, and to a better knowledge of the threats on the sites.

Despite this, the threats themselves have not decreased, with the possible exception of the level of illegal hunting but, without strong indicators, this is not readily measurable. As detailed in the sites progress reports, enormous pressures still exist on all sites, most particularly from extractive industries (i.e.: *oil*: Gamba, Conkouati; *minerals*: Gamba, Conkouati, Minkebe, Dzanga Sangha, Dja; *marine resources*: Gamba, Mayumba, Conkouati; *timber*: Gamba, Conkouati, Minkebe, Dzanga Sangha, Nouabale Ndoki, Lobeke; *sport hunting*: Dzanga Sangha, Lobeke). In this field, positive effects from this project could only come from the development of activities specifically addressing these threats and using the most appropriate channels of communication with those companies with the specific objective to mitigate them. Some remarkable achievements have already been recorded in this regard in the form of MOU and agreements on collaboration like WCS/CIB Agreement and PROGEPP project around Nouabale Ndoki; WWF/Bordamur Agreement around Minkebe; WWF/Decolvenaere MOU around Dja; Agreement with all stakeholders and communities around Lobeke; Shell policy in Gamba, etc. More similar initiatives are in the works, but an active involvement of the governments is a key factor to the success and the coherence of these approaches.

Objective 1 aims at “improving the management of selected sites”, but the project has unfortunately not collected baseline indicators in order to measure the progress made. If CAWHFI has undoubtedly improved the level of site *protection*, it is difficult at this point to state that the project has also improved their global *management*, because protection is of course only one aspect of PA management. The overall parks management, of which wardens are officially responsible, includes many other aspects that are not currently included in the project activities. This would involve the active building of capacity of senior park staff in various disciplines that they should master themselves as soon as possible. These include: developing/ finalizing parks management plans, developing and implementing law enforcement monitoring and ecological monitoring schemes; organizing plans evaluation; ensuring appropriate staff management, public relations, community relationships, conflict resolution, etc. Without a particular attention to these aspects, the project runs the risk to leave a properly protected site (which in itself would be a major achievement) with no capacity to develop and adapt to a changing situation (which would endanger its sustainability).

Another significant output of CAWHFI so far has been in the field of transboundary cooperation. Even if immediate concerns are still focused on site based issues, NGOs operating in contiguous CAWHFI sites have made a very good job at facilitating contacts and cooperation at landscape level. The site managers have made an active use of the project support to collaborative actions at bi- and tri-national levels. The effects recorded are that they reinforce the team spirit, they add an important dimension to the job of park staff, and they give a sense of belonging to an international conservation corporation supported by their Heads of States and the international community. This in turn strengthens the stature of ecoguards vis-à-vis local communities and poachers on both sides of the border. In the future, this will continue to facilitate the development of other transboundary initiatives which are important for the long term conservation of the sites, like joint research and monitoring, development of regional ecotourism, harmonized legislation, or joint planning.

Related to Objective 3, the setting up of national Tentative Lists in all 4 CAWHFI countries has certainly been a good achievement. Even if these lists are to be revised or amended by the governments, they are a very valid starting point to work on the promotion of the World Heritage values (related in particular to the need for a more professional management of sites), and to facilitate the submission of new sites to the WH List. In relation to the huge pressures from extractive industries on some of the CAWHFI sites, and the information provided by CAWHFI on the conditionality for WH listing, it is possible that an unexpected effect of the project will be the announcement by governments that the status of several protected areas will be modified in order to allow legal extraction of oil or minerals. The end effect would thus be that those sites would not be considered as potential WH sites, and CAWHFI will then have to decide on its continued support or to withdraw it.

After having facilitated the creation of the TNS Foundation and trust fund, CAWHFI partners have only just started to push for the constitution of a joint submission of the cluster of 3 PAs on the WH List. This will undoubtedly require a major support from CAWHFI partners if the project is intending to achieve this before the end of this phase. It would be extremely constructive (and this would also be a good marketing action) to carefully plan this specific support so that the submission to the WH Committee could be made by the Heads of States in time for the 2009 round, as a symbolic gesture marking the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Yaoundé Declaration.

CAWHFI being a relatively young project, the future effects of the project are still difficult to predict, as they will depend on the production of a number of outputs. In particular, if the protection of selected parks continues to be successfully strengthened with the support of this project, and if the achievements under Objective 2 turn out to be positive, then the results of CAWHFI will have generated a very positive effect on the conservation of biodiversity in the region. The project would indeed have succeeded to create a solid pool of forest protection in the sites, and the constructive relationships developed in the surrounding area with both local communities and extractive industries would contribute to a sustainable form of conservation and use of the landscape natural resources.

## **B. Sustainability of Results**

Two aspects have to be considered in assessing the sustainability of the project results: the human and financial dimensions.

There is currently a rather good prospect for continued use of project results by the beneficiaries. At the local level, the receptivity of national PA staff to project outputs is excellent, although the involvement of the senior staff in planning, as well as the flow of information from the sites to central administrations, should be strengthened. The receptivity of PA staff to the project outputs is good and there is no problem of understanding the validity or justification of any part of this project. The receptivity of central administration is directly depending on the personal involvement of the officers and on the government's priorities and support. To mention one important aspect of the sustainability of the project results - the quality of ecoguards trained - it is felt at this stage that it will depend increasingly on the project focusing, with full support from central administrations, on training national trainers. If this is not done, the availability of good ecoguards will continue to depend on the presence of outside projects. This again, should be an activity linked to RAPAC priorities.



There is indeed a problem of insufficient technical capacity in the CAWHFI sites, which are currently compensated by the continued presence and input from the NGOs and the project. Even if there is a strong will expressed by the national administrations to continue and strengthen the quality of management of the sites, there is a series of conditions that are not fulfilled at this point to ensure the sustainability of the project results:

- insufficient level of professional knowledge and expertise, linked to a lack of formal (or on the job) training in many disciplines of PA management ;
- insufficient conviction by the government that WH offers an appropriate framework for enhancing the quality of management;
- lack of technical support and insufficient delegation of responsibility from central administration;
- lack of recognition and respect of PAs by other decentralized administrations,
- etc.

If some of these aspects could certainly be tackled by re-orienting some activities of the project (an exercise that should be done while finalizing the project logical framework and preparing future work plans), others will be entirely dependent on the administration's internal policy and dynamics.

In terms of the financial dimension of sustaining the project results, the continued use of these results will obviously depend on the availability of funds. At this point, central administrations do not provide the funding required to sustain these results. Under its Objective 3, CAWHFI has planned in the second part (Yr 3 and 4) of its first phase to attract additional donors, finalize new funding arrangements and design and develop site-based trust funds. If these plans are successfully achieved, the prospect for sustainability will be much higher and the planning for phase 2 could be adapted to the individual challenges faced by the sites and the landscapes. A first round of discussions on priorities for a next phase has already been discussed among CAWHFI partners in September 2007.

In order to facilitate the maintenance of acquired capabilities at local and institutional levels and the continued use of project outputs, CAWHFI needs to look for more active synergy with other regional programmes, in view of sharing and complementing their resources, and better inscribing CAWHFI inputs into COMIFAC *Plan de Convergence*... There is therefore a clear need for a more coordinated planning within CBFP, RAPAC, ECOFAC, FORAF, and others.

### **C. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results**

No specific measures in the project document were taken by the project to address specific gender issues. All project partners and beneficiary administrations are implementing their own gender equity policy. The support provided by CAWHFI to the national PA management authorities includes hiring new ecoguards. In this context, applications from female candidates have been encouraged at all stage. Several have applied and a few have been selected. Although still uncommon, the presence of female parks employees is becoming a common feature in Central African countries, and this evaluation met with female ecoguards in Minkebe, Dzanga Sangha and Lobeke NP. All of them reported their satisfaction about their job and their working environment, and some male colleagues have acknowledged their respect for their professional qualities. Today, some female professionals occupy important

jobs, like Ms Solange Ngouessono, who is the very active chief warden in Mayumba NP, Gabon.

#### **D. Cost-Effectiveness**

From its total budget of 6.7 M USD, CAWHFI had spent slightly more than 3 M USD (the expenditures planned amounted to 3.36 M USD) at the end of its first 2 years of operations. Although slightly under-spent, the budget was allocated to the most pressing needs in terms of park staffing, infrastructure, and operations. Spread over a large number of PAs in a vast region where project running costs are high, the amount of achievements realized with this sum (cf. detailed progress reports) and within that period is considered to be very good. Both the national administration representatives and implementing NGOs reported their satisfaction.

The cost-effectiveness in managing the project at the level of UN agencies is deemed to be insufficient in the case of FAO (lack of follow up, inefficient role of Accra Office) and good in the case of UNESCO, who took most of the administrative management burden. As mentioned above, the cost-effectiveness of the project management could have been higher if roles and responsibilities of the 2 coordinators had been more clearly discussed and agreed at an early stage by all partners. A more effective synergy and information gathering and management between the WH programme officer, the CAWHFI regional coordinator, and the implementing NGOs would then have been achieved.

The cost of the project, however, would be significantly higher if a management fee at the level of the true administrative cost - currently absorbed by NGOs from their own resources - could be applied. One can therefore consider that NGOs are, to a certain extent, subsidizing this project. They are doing this unwillingly, because it is a common and widely accepted practice among donors that overheads and administrative costs are built in the budget of any field conservation project, as it is built in this one for UN agencies and funded by UNF from the project budget. This aspect could be reconsidered in the finalization of the funding arrangements between UNF and NGOs.

The project, as designed and implemented so far, has thus served as an effective means for achieving the immediate project objectives within the limit of the available resources. Considering the 2 objectives of CAWHFI under this evaluation, and the results obtained so far in the project phase, it is the opinion of the evaluator that the same resources could not have been used for an alternative design that would have produced the same results more effectively. The approach seems thus on the right track, but, as mentioned in various section of this report, there are still several key activities – both planned and unplanned - to undertake in the second part of this phase in order to meet the objectives of CAWHFI by 2010.

#### **E. Major Factors Affecting the Project Results**

The following is a synthesis analysis of major factors and conditions that have affected positively and negatively the effectiveness and efficiency of the project. These factors may have arisen from the project design, the implementation process as well as from external changes beyond the control of CAWHFI.

Among the **positive factors** and conditions, we can mention:

- the commitments made under the **Yaoundé Declaration** have generated a large (CBFP) partnership among donors, NGOs and other institutions which has set the scene for collaborative projects focused on the strategic priorities. These were materialized and detailed in the *Plan de Convergence*. This framework is therefore an important part of the rationale for CAWHFI alliance, which places the project among the key initiatives supporting the countries' commitments towards conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in the Congo Basin forests ;
- the **landscape approach** adopted by CAWHFI to design its strategies for sites conservation, for community and other stakeholders participation, and for the promotion of WH values, is in line with the landscape approach and transborder collaboration that is required in the implementation of the COMIFAC *Plan de Convergence*. This should facilitate the linking of CAWHFI activities with the *Plan's* operations and develop strategic cooperation with other regional initiatives;
- the development of the project has been subject to a very systematic and **participatory process** that included national, regional and international partners; this has ensured the identification of the most relevant and desired inputs from the project, as well as a good level of ownership among most of its actors;
- **UN-NGOs partnerships** for ensuring protection and strengthening management of WH sites have been promoted since 1999 by UNF as a key approach for enhancing the conservation prospects for protected areas. Such alliance on supporting biodiversity conservation in potential WH sites of Central Africa has allowed international NGOs to double the amount of funding that they could have mobilized alone for this project;
- the **determination and commitment of UN and NGO partners** for the CAWHFI objectives are very strong; the numerous and tangible achievements of the project in the field can be largely credited on the **experience and expertise of NGOs** who have a detailed knowledge of local situation ;
- the **success of UNESCO/WHC in securing additional funding** from FFEM to cover the entirety of CAWHFI Objective 2 activities. This freed up considerable amounts of funds which reinforced substantially the potential support for Objectives 1 and 3. This additional funding allowed the recent posting of a **permanent project coordinator** in the field, which will allow CAWHFI to facilitate the project implementation and deal better with a number of neglected aspects;
- the success of UNESCO/WHC in securing additional funding from Belgium; this has allowed the hiring of a **permanent project officer** so as to provide a permanent administrative and financial management support for CAWHFI ; although this funding will end soon, it has been instrumental to ensuring an adequate management of contractual obligations, organization of SC meetings, and networking among partners.

However, the progress of the project has also been influenced by the following **negative factors** and conditions:

- the **complexity and rigidity of administrative and financial procedure** have caused many delays and much frustration among partners. The defection of JGI from the alliance has shown that the project placed the strict respect of its procedures before the risks linked to the loss of a partner. This factor still causes concern and frustration to other NGOs, as well as the circuitous system imposed by contracts with UN agencies and UNF;
- the **insufficient knowledge in - and interest, by some of the beneficiary countries, of the WH Convention**, its Operational Guidelines, and its various mechanisms, as well as their lack of conviction that WH status could significantly “bring” something to the

country's PA network. This factor may partly explain the apparent lack of enthusiasm and involvement of central administrations for the project;

- the **rapid and uncoordinated turn-over of PA senior staff**; this factor, which depends on decisions taken at the level of central administrations, is a real obstacle to the efficient building-up of strong relationships and of professional management capacity;
- the insufficient recognition of CAWHFI is partly due to an **absence (so far) of public profile**; this could have been rectified by an earlier production and implementation of a communication strategy;
- the **inability of CAWHFI partners to set up a fully functional SC chaired by an active chairperson**; this is due to both over-ambitious TOR for the Committee and the under-capacity of UNESCO/WHC and NGOs to fulfil their commitments. The lack of a functional SC is particularly tangible in the insufficient implementation of some important, albeit missing, aspects planned in the project document;
- the **absence of a finalized logical framework** used as a project monitoring guide; this factor deprived the project partners of a useful monitoring tool, which would have helped to redress some identified weaknesses;
- the **lack of harmonized reporting formats and data collection systems**; despite the fact that a single format was foreseen in the UN-NGO contract, and that FAO was expected to propose an harmonized monitoring system, CAWHFI was unable to come up with a single reporting and monitoring format. This makes difficult the consolidation of information on the project progress and makes it impossible to consolidate the field data collected;
- the **absence until early 2007 of a permanent regional coordinator in the field**, and the **lack of clarity on the exact roles and responsibilities** of the field coordinator and of the project officer were a constraint on the quality of coordination, management and development of the project;
- an earlier strong coordination system would have helped CAWHFI partners to forge/strengthen links between the project and other major regional initiatives. This has led to **missed opportunities** to act as a group in developing collaborative relationships with national PAs administrations and with regional/ international bodies like RAPAC, FORAF, CARPE, COMIFAC, UN Offices, IUCN, etc.
- the **absence, in the project activities, of a specific focus on training PA senior staff** in management planning; this may threaten the sustainability of the project inputs and leave the targeted PAs under near-total dependency from external support;
- a **strong increase of pressures on the natural resources of PAs and their peripheral zones** mainly due to extractive industries; both legal and illegal activities exist and many are done in total contradiction with existing laws. In many cases, **authorities turn a blind eye on infractions** and in others they seem to benefit from the association with the companies. In doing so, authorities act against the political will to get Yaoundé commitments implemented in the field. This factor goes directly against the project global objective.

## VII. Conclusions and Recommendations

### A. Conclusions

CAWHFI is a strong project because its purpose and approaches are simple and mainly built on the knowledge and expertise of the actors themselves. Its objectives are therefore eminently relevant to the needs of conserving forest biodiversity in Central Africa in this early 21<sup>st</sup> century. Its design, however, suffered from the over-ambitious presumption that managing and coordinating such complex structure could be done without changing the existing procedures and adapting the capacity of the partners from the start of the project.

As the main facilitator of CAWHFI, UNESCO/WHC succeeded to compensate this lack of capacity by securing additional funding and adding 2 permanent staff in its team to that effect. This is an important strength of the project. However, if the integration of these 2 staff and the information on their respective function within the alliance had been better communicated to the partners, their input (already significant) could have been more effective. Similarly, the main project decision-making forum, the Steering Committee, could not yet hold its important function of project monitoring, both because no permanent chairperson was nominated and because the project logframe was not finalized. UNESCO's input has considerably raised the visibility of CAWHFI, allowed to disseminate key information on the World Heritage, and increased the interest of many parties in the sub-region.

The very complex and rigid administrative mechanism that emanated mostly from UNF and UN agencies procedures caused much delays and frustrations in the implementation of the project. In the opinion of the evaluator, there is little justification to apply those procedures and requirements to a project which operates in an already difficult context, as it put an additional, useless burden on all partners.

Despite these management hurdles, CAWHFI has produced a number of important results in focusing its support, under project Objective 1, to basic and urgent inputs needed to enhance the management of selected sites. By allowing an increase of staff, providing vital infrastructure and equipment, and supporting most of the PAs operating costs, the project has provided those most important PAs with the means to decrease the many threats on their integrity. This has undoubtedly contributed to the conservation of critical populations of flagship species, some of which are threatened or endangered. Unfortunately, the project has not yet developed a set of indicators that would allow to precisely measure its own performances and the impact of its activities.

If CAWHFI investment in capacity building has proved to be essential in maintaining an acceptable level of protection, the project has not yet actively invested in the training of wardens and other specialized senior park staff. This activity, which should focus on various aspects of management planning, will have to be developed in the second half of this project phase. If not, the project might not be able to reach its overall objective to support and promote *“the development of protected area management (...) that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status”*.

Among CAWHFI's strongest assets are (a) its approach through landscape planning and (b) the promotion of transboundary cooperation. These two values are at the heart of the

COMIFAC *Plan de Convergence* which put in practice the commitments made in the Yaoundé Declaration. In the TNS landscape, the advances made in transborder cooperation, funding mechanism, and in the institutionalization of tri-national conservation, foreshadow the future joint submission of this cluster of PAs to the World Heritage List. Despite this, CAWHFI has not linked its inputs with the progress expected from the *Plan de Convergence*, and has not yet developed formal coordination mechanisms with other regional initiatives.

While the design of CAWHFI was made with the concern to complement the governments and other projects inputs, the sustainability of the project is still at risk at this stage. The prospect for sustainability will remain weak without the addition of:

- sustainable funding mechanisms (planned by CAWHFI in the next 2 years);
- a more active involvement of the governments (staff management, law enforcement, implementation of regional commitments, implementation of WH Convention, etc.);
- a specific training scheme focused on PA senior staff (planning, management, monitoring & evaluation, communication, etc.).

## **B. Recommendations<sup>5</sup>**

1. **UNF and UN agencies:** As already recommended during the *Knowledge Gathering Workshops* in 2003 (Durban) and 2005 (Washington), consider all possible avenues for **simplifying contractual and funding arrangements in UN-NGOs partnerships** for World Heritage. This would include taking into consideration all the recommendations made for administrative and financial procedures.
2. **Steering Committee:** As a matter of priority, ensure that a specific meeting session be allocated to the completion and validation of a **final project logical framework** that would include expected project outputs, performance indicators, and assumptions, in order to use it systematically as a collegial monitoring tool. If the global objective of the project is to raise the quality of the parks management to a level that meets the conditions for their World Heritage listing, the logical framework must also include specific activities towards the fulfillment of these conditions.
3. **UNF, UNESCO and the Steering Committee:** should discuss and clarify, for the benefit of each partner, the **respective roles of the WHC programme officer (Cédric Hance) and of the CAWHFI regional coordinator (Jean-Christophe Lefeuvre)** in terms of their coordination and management duties. A clearer apportionment of their tasks, discussed and agreed among all members of the Steering Committee, would confer a greater efficiency and effectiveness to their work and would generate a genuine ownership of their function by all partners. As the external funding for the WHC programme officer terminates in September 2008, **a reallocation in the CAWHFI budget should allow to keep this important position** until the end of the current phase.
4. **CAWHFI regional coordinator:** In close collaboration with NGOs, **strengthen the flow of information from the project to the central administrations, selected regional initiatives, and the UN representations** in the 4 CAWHFI countries, in order to generate more interest and involvement.
5. **Steering Committee: Finalize the communication strategy** and clarify the role of each partner in the day to day management of communication.
6. **Steering Committee and UNESCO:** Exert a **specific lobbying on Party States and extractive companies in view of mitigating or solving problems affecting the sites integrity**. This should be regarded by all members of the Committee, and especially by UNESCO, as an urgent contribution to the success of CAWHFI. As foreseen in CAWHFI project document, it is recommended that high level personalities from UNF, UN agencies, and NGOs play an active role in advocating for these sites. These priority topics and targets for advocacy should be built in the project's communication strategy.
7. **Steering Committee and NGOs:** Consider the development of **harmonized ecological -, law enforcement -, and regional bushmeat trade monitoring systems** which could be applied by all sites. When collected data will be of a similar nature, it will be possible to consolidate, analyze and compare results and trends, as well as contribute to the regional data banks that will be developed by RAPAC and FORAF.

---

<sup>5</sup> A number of additional recommendations have already been formulated by CAWHFI partners during their Technical- and Steering Committee meetings; these should also be taken into consideration.

8. **Steering Committee and NGOs:** In view of the absence of a management plan in most of the CAWHFI sites, a support should be included specifically to develop such plans and finalize them before the end of the project phase. In order to reach the planned output, CAWHFI should put **much more effort on the training of senior park staff in the field of management planning**. To that effect, UNESCO/WHC could seek an arrangement with IUCN/WCPA for technical support in the field of parks management planning and parks management effectiveness monitoring. There should be a clear strategy to strengthen the sustainability of this project by providing formal and non formal training to wardens with the view of building, as quickly as possible, their capacity to “design, adopt and operate” management plans.
9. **Steering Committee:** As the main justification of CAWHFI is its support to the Yaoundé Declaration, the project must be able to accurately measure the progress made by CAWHFI’s contribution towards the objectives of the *Plan de Convergence* and not only its own. Therefore, there should be a close link between CAWHFI’s Steering Committee who must assess the project performances, and the organizations mandated by COMIFAC to drive the activities geared towards COMIFAC’s objectives. Since RAPAC is the institution that was mandated to coordinate sub-regional activities related to protected areas management and biodiversity conservation, a **much closer link between CAWHFI and RAPAC** in the field of coordination and information management would be expected in this regard. Since RAPAC has recently strengthened its own strategic plan (2008-2017), which includes a number of priorities similar to CAWHFI’s, the linkages between both initiatives should be institutionalized. This should particularly concern the management of RAPAC’s “Pilot Sites”, the transmission of data, and the exchange of information.
10. **Steering Committee and NGOs:** As WCS and WWF have expressed their commitment to link their involvement in World Heritage sites with their **support to PoWPA**, CAWHFI should consider strengthening the linkages between NGOs work in the selected sites and the PoWPA priorities that must be implemented by all CBD State Parties.
11. **UNESCO/WHC:** A thorough **explanation of the benefits that the World Heritage status** actually brings to a listed site, to its host country, and to the international community, should be done by UNESCO to all partners and especially national authorities at all levels. This should be based on the text of the World Heritage Convention and on its Operational Guidelines, and include a wide circulation of promotional material and key documents like the UNESCO Report on the outcomes of the last World Park Congress (UNESCO 2005c). This would help stakeholders and interested parties to better apprehend the added values of World Heritage nominations.
12. **Steering Committee:** Plan for the extensive efforts in terms of technical support, communication and advocacy that will be needed to organize, in Year 3 or 4 of the project, a regional meeting for the preparation of the **harmonized submission of the cluster of 3 PAs of the Tri-National de la Sangha to the WH List** by the 3 concerned countries. This will require a major support from CAWHFI partners if the project intends to achieve this output before the end of this phase. It would be extremely wise in terms of communication and marketing to plan this specific support so that the submission by the 3 countries could coincide with the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Yaoundé Declaration.



## VIII. Lessons Learned

1. **Political will is not readily translated in field action.** Despite the political will expressed by the countries Heads of States in the Yaoundé Declaration, the responsibilities devolved to central administrations and other institutions to implement COMIFAC's *Plan de Convergence* and the support of many donors, NGOs and institutions grouped in the CBFP, the global working environment in which the field staff operates is not yet fully conducive to the success of the project. Pressures of all sorts on key forest ecosystems go practically unabated, or are even increasing, and are still threatening selected protected areas of potential outstanding universal value, which are also part of strategically important transboundary landscapes for Yaoundé countries. Despite the political will and enabling legislations, bad governance still dominates, and the project will have to live and to deal with a mostly non-supportive environment that goes opposite to the official policy.
2. **Recognition of the concept of World Heritage is not innate.** Even if the project has based his third Objective on the use of the World Heritage image to improve protected areas management and ensure long-term financing, the concept of World Heritage is not well apprehended yet, and a lot of groundwork has still to be done in terms of awareness. The importance and attractiveness of listing new sites on the WH List must be shared not only by project partners, but also by national authorities and the public at large. This type of project should thus have begun with a solid communication strategy from the start.
3. **The project concept was slightly over-ambitious.** A number of responsibilities given by project partners to their representatives on the Steering Committee, as well as responsibilities accepted by partners themselves, were over-ambitious given their limited availability and/or capacity, and could not be honoured. As a consequence, an effective coordination and management of the project came one year after the project start, the key function of chairing the SC was not filled, the project logframe was not finalized, and a number of important outputs were delayed. Although corrective measures have been taken on some of these consequences, the work plans for Years 3 and 4 will still have to integrate remedial actions.
4. **Rigidity in administrative and financial procedures is an obstacle to the project effectiveness.** CAWHFI has suffered from the same weaknesses that were identified as significant obstacles in similar UNF/UN/NGOs partnerships for World Heritage around the world. There is a latent risk that this kind of potentially extremely effective project be hampered by its own administrative mechanism, and that key NGO actors decide to withdraw because of their inability to fulfil co-funding arrangements, or unwillingness to accept cumbersome contractual conditions.
5. **The alliance's networking resources are still under-used.** Although the UNF/UN/NGOs CAWHFI alliance is based on a partnership where each partner brings its expertise, network and resources, the experience has shown that a number of challenges faced by the project have not yet been tackled with the support provided from outside its direct actors. For example, promotion of ecotourism in CAWHFI sites at international level, technical support in specific fields of PA management, occasional advocacy or lobbying interventions, are all topics in which more related activities could have been organized if partners had activated their respective networks.

## **IX. Annexes**

- Annex 1: Terms of reference of the evaluation**
- Annex 2: List of places visited and persons met**
- Annex 3: List of documents consulted**
- Annex 4: Integrated CAWHFI/FFEM logical framework**
- Annex 5: IUCN WPC Recommendation V.21 on World Heritage**
- Annex 6: Excerpt of the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention**
- Annex 7: Administrative requirements for CAWHFI annual transfers: the case of WWF**
- Annex 8: List of RAPAC Pilot Sites**
- Annex 9: Map of CAWHFI selected landscapes and sites**

## Annex 1

# Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Evaluation of the Central African World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI)

## 1. Background

The Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI) seeks to improve the sustainable management of selected clusters of protected areas of three ecological landscapes of the Congo Basin. CAWHFI's general objective is formulated as follow:

*“Promote and support the building of management regimes for Central Africa forest protected areas that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status and effectively combat the principal threats of illegal hunting and unregulated bushmeat trade”.*

The project is implemented jointly by 2 UN agencies: UNESCO – World Heritage Center (WHC) and UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in collaboration with the protected Area Management Authorities of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon and Republic of Congo as well as 3 international conservation NGO: Conservation International/CyberTracker Conservation, Wildlife Conservation Society and World Wildlife Fund for Nature<sup>6</sup>.

The funding of CAWHFI is provided by United Nations Foundation (UNF) and includes also matching funds from contributing donors.

The UNF funded component of the project is operating with a total budget of US\$6,787,360 from which the UNF contribution represents US\$ 6,600,000 (including US\$ 3,300,000 matching funds).

The project document was signed on May 9, 2003 and the project started on June 1, 2004 with the first instalment transferred to UNESCO.

Expected project completion date is now June 1<sup>st</sup> 2010. *(Grant extension approved by UNF on 2/1/07)*

Following the launching of the FFEM (Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial; *i.e. the French GEF*) component of the Initiative in late 2006/early 2007, and as decided in 2006 steering committee meeting, CAWHFI's logframe has been slightly reviewed and its main objectives reformulated to reflect the extended scope of the combined program. New immediate CAWHFI objectives adopted express as follow:

1. Improve the management of selected protected areas of potential outstanding universal value
2. Improve natural resource management, particularly wildlife, in the forest landscape around selected protected areas of outstanding universal value
3. Use World Heritage status to improve biodiversity conservation and protected area management in the Congo Basin

Original CAWHFI-UNF immediate objectives 1 and 2 are being summarized in the first above-mentioned objective that includes both “combat illegal hunting and regulate bushmeat trade” and “strengthen law enforcement in selected protected areas” aspects. The second objective refers to the FFEM component. It specifically aims to (1) build capacity in the surroundings of protected areas to allow common-based wildlife resource management; (2) elaborate wildlife management plans for these areas with all stakeholders; (3) Implement and monitor wildlife management plans. This objective also includes several

---

<sup>6</sup> NB: The Jane Goodall Institute was initially member of the partnership but withdrew as it encountered difficulties to raise the appropriate amount of matching funds.

activities initially planned in the original CAWHFI-UNF activities to be implemented by JGI (Jane Goodall Institute) but goes much further in working with local population and other stakeholders involved in protected area surroundings. The third immediate objective remains unchanged and seeks to raise local, national and international awareness on the outstanding universal value of selected protected areas to raise management schemes at a level befitting World Heritage status.

CAWHFI's activities are implemented in three ecological landscapes:

- Sangha Tri-National (TNS):** a transboundary landscape composed of Lobeke National Park (Cameroon), Dzanga Sangha National Park (Central African Republic) and Nouabale Ndoki National Park (Congo).
- Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe (TRIDOM):** a transboundary landscape composed of Minkebe NP (Gabon), Odzala NP (Congo) and the Dja Faunal Reserve and World Heritage Site (Cameroon). The Cameroonian part of TRIDOM also includes the newly created Boumba Bek and Nki National Parks.
- Gamba-Conkouati:** a transboundary landscape composed of the Gamba complex of protected areas (Gabon), the Mayumba NP (Gabon) and the Conkouati-Douli NP (Congo).

Program implementation in 2006 began with the first CAWHFI steering committee. It took place in Libreville (Gabon) on February 13-17, 2006. This meeting enabled all partners to meet for the first time within the CAWHFI framework since program activities started. It aimed to present all achievements made during the first year of program implementation and led to interesting experience sharing among participants. The steering committee began with a two-day technical meeting where NGO partners gathered with UNESCO and UNF representatives to discuss and adopt key strategic orientation and continued with a workshop involving all national park chief wardens of CAWHFI sites and wildlife country directors. Main topics discussed during this workshop focused on reinforcement of landscape integration, transboundary collaboration and negotiation and adoption of joint activities work plans.

Second CAWHFI steering committee meeting took place in Libreville on March 19-21. The participants reviewed the progress made in the year two and worked on identification of actions needed for an effective implementation of the project objectives. The FFEM component was presented and complementarities in both components were explored.

It is important to mention that with 4 countries, 2 UN agencies and 3 partner NGO involved, CAWHFI is a very complex programme, requiring important investment in program coordination. On top of this, the financial structure of the project is very complicated, as a result of the complex matching of funds (with part of the funds returning directly to the NGO but reported on by UNESCO and FAO), the involvement of 2 UN agencies in financial management of the grant and the complicated structure of the budget.

Given the complexity of the project some difficulties were experienced, related mainly to slow financial transfers and late financial reporting, causing considerable delay in the project implementation.

## **2. Purpose of the Evaluation**

In the project document two evaluation have been planned, a formal mid-term evaluation at the end of Year 2 and a final evaluation towards the end of Year 4. The mid-term evaluation will cover the UNF component of the project; FFEM component which joined the Initiative later will has its own evaluation at latter stage. However during the evaluation the consultant is encouraged to collaborate closely with the coordinator of the FFEM component who is based permanently in Libreville, Gabon, and who can provide valuable insights and logistical/technical support to the evaluation mission.

The mid-term evaluation is intended to review the progress towards the project objectives, identify bottlenecks and opportunities, and to provide recommendations to the project partners (Steering

Committee, UNESCO, FAO, NGOs and Governments, and the donor) on the further steps necessary to consolidate progress and ensure achievement of objectives by the end of the projects.

The evaluation should also make recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and make detailed recommendations on the work-plan for the remainder of the project. Any further need for external assistance will be identified.

### **3. Scope of the Evaluation**

The following represents the minimum coverage of points to be included, but in any case, it should be adapted to specific concerns and issues that the mission is expected to address:

The mission will assess the:

- h)** Relevance of the project to development priorities and needs.
- i)** Clarity and realism of the project's development and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability.
- j)** Quality, clarity and adequacy of project design including:
  - clarity and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame);
  - realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks);
  - realism and clarity of external institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan;
  - likely cost-effectiveness of the project design.
- k)** Efficiency and adequacy of project implementation including: availability of funds as compared with budget for the donor, implementing agencies and partners in the field; the quality and timeliness of input delivery by both implementation agencies and the partner NGOs; managerial and work efficiency; implementation difficulties; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the extent of national support and commitment and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by UNESCO and FAO.
- l)** Project results, including a full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives). The mission will especially review the status and quality of work on World Heritage status of potential protected area sites.
- m)** The prospects for sustaining the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project.
- n)** The cost-effectiveness of the project.

Based on the above analysis the mission will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by Government and/or partner NGOs/UNESCO/FAO/donor to ensure sustainable development, including any need for additional assistance and activities of the project prior to its completion. The mission will draw attention to any lessons of general interest. Any proposal for further assistance should include precise specification of objectives and the major suggested outputs and inputs.

#### **4. Composition of the Mission**

For budgetary reasons the partners agreed that the mission will be composed by one highly experienced independent evaluation expert (team leader), accompanied by the FAO sub-regional forestry officer. The expert (Team Leader) should be independent and thus have no previous direct involvement with the project either with regard to its formulation, implementation or backstopping. The FAO sub-regional forestry officer is considered as independent since he joined FAO very recently and has not been involved in the project so far.

#### **5. Timetable and Itinerary of the Mission**

The mission will start by two days desk work at consultants home to allow him to read all relevant documents and prepare the mission. All relevant documents in electronic version will be made available to the consultant by the coordinator of the project at UNESCO at least two weeks before the start of the mission. On his way to the project sites, the consultant will stop for a briefing at UNESCO in Paris (one day) and then travel to Gabon, Congo-Brazzaville, Cameroon and Central African Republic. The mission will pay visits to country representations of UNESCO, FAO, country offices of partner NGOs (WCS, WWF) and governmental agencies involved in the project implementation. Field visits will be organized to the selected project sites to review the reality in the field and interview the field staff. (25 days). The evaluation will not attempt to cover every project site but rather to get a more in-depth view of a representative sample of locations in different landscapes (in **Trinational Sanga-TNS**: Lobeke (Cameroon),

Dzangha-Sanga (RCA), Nouabalé-Ndoki (Congo); in **TRIDOM**: Minkebe (Gabon); and in **Gamba-Conkouati**: Conkouati (Congo)). The field missions will be organized with the support of the FAO Sub-regional Office, the FFEM component of the project and the local partners (NGOs and Government). Towards the end of the mission a draft report should be discussed in-country with relevant stakeholders (workshop can be organised for this purpose) and comments arising from these meetings should be incorporated in the final document (3 days).

A final one day debriefing will be organized at the end of the mission at UNESCO in Paris.

The mission will be also briefed and debriefed by phone by the responsible FAO technical officer.

The mission will be finished by three days desk work to finalize the report.

Total number of days: 35

#### **6. Consultations**

The mission will maintain close liaison with the Representatives of the UNESCO, FAO, the donor and the concerned national agencies and partner NGOs. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the FAO, UNESCO, the Government, or the donor.

#### **7. Reporting**

The mission is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government, the donor or FAO/UNESCO and involved ONGs. The report will be written in conformity with the headings shown in Annex.

The report will be completed, to the extent possible, in the country and the findings and recommendations fully discussed with all concerned parties and wherever possible consensus achieved.

The mission will also complete the FAO Project Evaluation Questionnaire.

The mission leader bears responsibility for finalization of the report, which will be submitted to FAO within two weeks of mission completion. FAO will submit the report to all project partners together with its comments.

## ANNEX

### **Outline of an On-going Evaluation Report<sup>7</sup>**

- I. Executive Summary (Main Findings and Recommendations)**
- II. Introduction**
- III. Background and Context**
- IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design**
  - A. Justification
  - B. Objectives
  - C. Project Design
- V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management**
  - A. Project Budget and Expenditure
  - B. Activities and Outputs
  - C. Government Support
  - D. Project Management
  - E. Technical and Operational Backstopping
- VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness**
  - A. Effects and Impact
  - B. Sustainability and Environmental Impact of Results
  - C. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results
  - D. Cost-effectiveness
  - E. Major Factors Affecting the Project Results
- VII. Conclusions and Recommendations**
  - A. Conclusions
  - B. Recommendations
- VIII. Lessons Learned**

#### **Annexes**

1. Terms of Reference
2. List of places visited and key persons met by the mission
3. List of documents and other reference materials consulted by the mission

---

<sup>7</sup> This outline is applicable to FAO-executed projects, especially Trust Fund projects - for UNDP funded projects, the UNDP format may be used.

## **Contents of the Report of an Ongoing Evaluation Mission of a Technical Cooperation Project<sup>8</sup>**

### **I. Executive Summary (Main Findings and Recommendations)**

It should read as an executive summary and contain a brief recapitulation of the main findings and recommendations for action. The points covered include:

- A summary of the project purpose and structure and a brief description of the reason for the evaluation, along with composition and timing of the mission.
- Main findings, including a critical overview of major factors and conditions that have affected positively and negatively the efficiency and effectiveness of the project. These may cover the original project concept and design (including underlying assumptions), conditions affecting the project implementation (institutional/infrastructural constraints, management and coordination of the project, constraints in mobilising the necessary resources) as well as the socio-economic and policy factors affecting the participation of the beneficiaries in the project.
- Recommendations for future orientation and follow-up action to Donor, FAO and Government.

The summary should be brief (not more than 2-3 pages) and with cross references to the text to ensure it can be read easily by key people.

### **II. Introduction**

Reasons for mounting the evaluation mission (terms of reference to be annexed to the report) and its composition. The persons met, mission itinerary and documents consulted by the mission should be shown in Annex.

### **III. Background and Context**

Brief description of the project and its rationale, including the problems and constraints to be addressed by the project; the institutional, socio-economic, technical and environmental setting at the time of its approval. Any major changes in the setting which may have taken place since then; complementarities with other programmes or projects in the country/region; cost, starting date and duration of the project.

### **IV. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design**

#### **A. Justification**

---

<sup>8</sup> Not all evaluations would be able to adequately cover each and every aspect. On-going (internal and external) evaluations are likely to be limited in their treatment of effectiveness and impact, focusing more on the implementation process and the assessment of outputs. The evaluation team is also encouraged to check this list of contents against the aspects covered in the Project Evaluation Questionnaire issued by FAO.



A critical analysis of project concept and its economic and social significance in terms of: needs of the sector/sub-sector; the people involved; government policies; and the institutional framework within which the project operates. Cost-effectiveness of the technology and relevance of the approach chosen.

**B. Objectives**

1. A summary of the original project objective statements and any revisions which may have taken place since approval.
2. A critical reappraisal of the project's immediate and long-term objectives, in terms of their clarity, precision and relevance to: (a) the ultimate development action(s); (b) identified needs to which the project is expected to contribute, and (c) realism/validity of underlying strategic considerations in realizing the objectives. As objectives, especially the immediate objectives, may not be clearly stated, it may be necessary to provide an interpretation of what the project was intended to do.

**C. Project Design**

1. Adequacy in identifying the immediate and ultimate beneficiaries of the project, including the assessment of their specific needs and specification of the strategy and mechanisms by which the beneficiaries are expected to be reached.
2. Assessment of the overall project logic, i.e. adequacy of linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives, including whether the project design represents the cost-effective response to the problems being addressed.
3. Clarity and precision of description of project outputs; adequacy with which outputs are specified so as to fulfil immediate objectives.
4. Clarity and precision in the description of planned project activities; realism in the project's work plan (scheduling and duration of major project activities); adequacy of planned project inputs to be supplied by donor and host government; adequacy and realism of project duration.
5. Clarity and appropriateness of the project's internal management structure.
6. Major risks and assumptions explicit or implicit in the project design.
7. Review of the institutional setting and external linkages (e.g. Government policies and programmes) which have a bearing on project objectives and operations.

**V. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management**

**A. Project Budget and Expenditure**

Assessment of the rate of delivery and the quality of project inputs from both donor and Government, compared to original plan in project document.

**B. Activities and Outputs**

Systematic comparison of actual project activities and outputs with those foreseen in original project document and subsequent work plans in terms of quality, quantity and adequacy; indications of gaps and delays in the execution of activities and production of outputs and causes thereof, including those outside the direct control of project management; effects of such gaps and delays on planned output and follow-up action; remedial measures taken or contemplated, if any.

**C. Government Support**

Direct government support in terms of policy and degree of participation in project operations; the role and effectiveness of the coordination bodies/committees (if any) in solving project difficulties and giving it the needed support and direction.

**D. Project Management**

Effectiveness and efficiency of project management; collaboration with host institution; any steps taken to transfer of full responsibility of project management to national staff

**E. Technical and Operational Backstopping**

Extent and quality of operational/administrative and technical backstopping received by the project staff; effectiveness of the role played by the representative of donor and executing agencies at the country level; use made of monitoring information by management (at project and FAO Regional/HQ levels); extent to which internal evaluations (including Tripartite Reviews) have been carried out, their efficiency and effectiveness (corrective actions taken based on their findings).

**VI. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness**

**A. Effects and Impact**

Use made of outputs by the intended or actual target group(s) and progress achieved towards the realisation of project objectives. Actual and likely future effects of the project should be discussed. Probable effects should be compared with project's immediate objectives and include any unplanned effects.

Extent to which project effects are likely to contribute to the development objective; significance of such contribution (developmental change); prospects for appropriate policy decisions and mobilisation of resources (both internal and external).

**B. Sustainability and Environmental Impact of Results**

Prospects for continued use of project results by beneficiaries: their receptivity to, and adaptation of, project outputs for further development activities; maintenance of acquired capabilities at local and institutional levels; if appropriate, impact on existing natural resources in terms of maintenance or regeneration of the production base.

**C. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results**

Analysis of measures taken by the project to address specific gender issues, together with the assessment of their adequacy, relevance and effectiveness in redressing the limiting factors identified.

**D. Cost-Effectiveness**

Assessment of the extent to which the project (as designed and implemented) has served (is serving) as an effective means for achieving the immediate project objectives within the limit of resources available to the project (or simply put, the same resources could have been used for another alternative design that could have achieved the same objectives more effectively?). Check also if there is evidence that efforts have been made to consider alternative means and ways of achieving the objectives, including the selection of outputs.

**E. Major Factors Affecting the Project Results**

A synthesis analysis of major factors and conditions that have affected positively and negatively the effectiveness and efficiency of the project - these may have arisen from the project design, the

implementation process as well as external changes beyond the control of the project (also included in the second item of Section I above). This analysis should serve as a main basis for drawing lessons and recommendations for future actions.

## **VII. Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **A. Conclusions**

This section should present a concise synthesis of main findings in the preceding sections of the report and should draw conclusions regarding the relevance and adequacy of the project objectives and design, the efficiency in project execution and effectiveness in reaching the intended objectives (the production of outputs, the probable effects and impact), strengths and weaknesses of the design and implementation of the project, and the prospects for follow-up. The findings should provide a clear basis for the recommendations which follow.

### **B. Recommendations**

Recommendations should be clearly addressed to each one of the concerned parties, i.e. the donor, the host Government, the executing agency and the project management, as appropriate. They should be realistic, specific and stated in operational terms to the extent possible. Recommendations concerned with on-going project activities and those concerned with follow-up activities once the project is terminated should be presented separately.

- A mid-term evaluation should normally include a suggested work plan as an annex and should summarise major changes required in planned inputs and outputs and, if applicable, objectives.
- A terminal evaluation, if it recommends a follow-up phase, should include at least the objectives, major outputs and activities, and an indication of the inputs required.

Detailed technical recommendations are encouraged but may appear in a separate annex.

## **VIII. Lessons Learned**

Key findings (substantive, methodological or procedural) relevant to the design and implementation of similar projects of programmes should be highlighted. It may also cover critical issues of a generic nature that would require attention in designing and implementing similar projects and programmes.

## **Annex 2 : List of places visited and key persons met by the mission**

### **A. Places visited**

#### **November 2007**

- S11 Brussels – Paris;
- M12 Paris: UNESCO briefing at World Heritage Center
- T13 Paris – Libreville; briefing with JC Lefeuvre and JC Nguinguiri
- W14 Libreville – Makokou ; meeting with local authorities, Eaux & Forêts, WWF
- T15 Visit Bordamur Grands Bois concession; interviews with Park and WWF senior staff
- F16 Makokou – Belinga – Mayibout - Camp Nouna (Minkebe NP); interviews field staff
- S17 Makokou – Libreville; talks with WWF Office staff
- S18 Libreville: desk work, meeting with Executive Secretary of RAPAC
- M19 Libreville: meetings with Philippe Mortier (ex-CTC Odzala), WWF and WCS.
- T20 Libreville – Pointe Noire; meeting with Bryan Curran WCS
- W21 Pointe Noire – Conkouati Douli NP; talks with WCS staff
- T22 Conkouati: meeting with WCS staff, Park Warden and Marine Turtle monitoring team
- F23 Conkouati – Pointe Noire; talks with David Greer, JGI (ex-WWF Dzanga Sangha)
- S24 Pointe Noire – Brazzaville; work at WCS Country Office
- S25 Brazzaville: desk work at WCS Country Office
- M26 Brazzaville: meeting with UNESCO and EU Delegation; Brazzaville – Bangui
- T27 Bangui: meetings with MEFCPE, WWF, FAO, UNESCO
- W28 Bangui – Bayanga (Dzanga Sangha Complex)
- T29 Bayanga: meetings with WWF staff and Park Warden, visit Dzanga bai
- F30 Bayanga: meetings with WWF and Park staff, visit Bayanga authority and SGB base

#### **December 2007**

- S1 Bayanga – Bomassa; talks with WCS staff
- S2 Bomassa: meetings with WCS staff and Nouabale-Ndoki NP warden
- M3 Bomassa – Mondika; visit habituated gorilla group; talks with gorilla tracking team
- T4 Mondika – Bomassa; meeting with WCS staff and Park assistant warden
- W5 Bomassa – Djembé (control post) – Libongo (TNS base, SEFAC concession) – Mambélé
- T6 Mambélé: meetings with WWF staff and Lobéké NP staff
- F7 Mambélé – Yokadouma (WWF SE Cameroon Programme Office) – Bertoua
- S8 Bertoua – Yaoundé
- S9 Yaoundé: desk work
- M10 Yaoundé: meeting with WWF CARPO, UNESCO and MINFOF staff,
- T11 Yaoundé – Douala – Libreville
- W12 Libreville: desk work – preparation of debriefing
- T13 Libreville (debriefing for partners at FAO offices) – Paris
- F14 Paris: debriefing at World Heritage Center UNESCO
- S15 Paris - Brussels

## B. Key persons met

### General (*non site-related*)

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Cédric Hance                | UNESCO WHC Associate Expert                                       |
| Jean-Christophe Lefeuvre    | CAWHFI Regional Coordinator                                       |
| Jean-Claude Nguingiri       | FAO Central Africa Forest Programme Specialist                    |
| Benoît Horemans             | FAO Sub-regional Coordinator for Central Africa                   |
| Jean-Pierre Agnangoye       | RAPAC Secretary General   |
| Florence Palla              | RAPAC Communications Officer                                      |
| Brigitte Carr-Dirick        | WWF CARPO Conservation Finance Specialist                         |
| Pauwel De Wachter           | WWF TRIDOM Landscape Leader and CAWHFI Focal Pt                   |
| Jonas Nagahuedi Mbongu Sodi | COMIFAC Executive Secretary                                       |
| Lee White                   | WCS Director of Conservation Strategy for Ogooué and Congo Basins |
| Joe Walston                 | WCS Gabon Country Programme Director                              |
| Romain Calaque              | WCS Gabon Country Programme Assistant Director                    |
| Jean-Pierre Vande weghe     | WCS Gabon Scientific Advisor                                      |
| Bryan Curran                | WCS Congo Country Programme Director                              |
| Nilda Beatriz Anglarill     | UNESCO Representative, Rep. of Congo                              |
| Arnaud Anselin              | UE Programme Officer Forêt-Environnement, Rep. Congo              |
| Etienne Ngounio-Gabia       | FAO Assistant Representative, CAR Programme                       |
| Hélène Cron                 | UNESCO Programme Officer for CAR                                  |
| Laurent Somé                | WWF CARPO Representative  |
| Martin Tchamba              | WWF CARPO Senior Conservation Advisor                             |
| Aboubakar Mougnot           | WWF CARPO Programme Administrative Auditor                        |
| François Abe                | WWF F&A Manager, Cameroon Country Programme                       |
| Camille Okomo               | MEFPPN, Conseiller du DGEF (Congo)                                |
| Célestine Mengue            | WWF CARPO, Chargée de Programme Gabon                             |
| Philbert Owono              | MINEF, Conseiller DFC (Gabon)                                     |
| Célestine Ntsame-Okwo       | OIBT, Regional Representative for Africa                          |
| Allogo Constant             | CARPE/UICN Focal Point for Gabon                                  |

### TRIDOM

#### Minkebe

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Gustave Mabaza          | WWF Minkebe East Project Coordinator              |
| Jean-Noël Okogo         | WWF Logisticien-driver                            |
| André Alemon            | WWF Ecogarde-boat driver                          |
| Joseph Makanga-Loembe   | Secrétaire Général de Province Ogooué-Ivindo      |
| Blaise-Vincent Djidji   | Vice-Président Conseil Départemental de l'Ivindo  |
| Sosthène Ndong-Obiang   | CNPN Warden Minkebe East NP                       |
| Jean-Samuel Edang Obame | MEFEPPN Chef de Brigade Adj. de Faune             |
| Patrick Koumbi          | MEFEPPN Ecogarde Brigade de Faune                 |
| Symphorien Moro         | MEFEPPN Agent des Eaux et Forêts                  |
| Cyr Ndong-Obiang        | MEFEPPN Inspecteur Provincial Adj. Eaux et Forêts |
| Mr Tiong                | Bordamur Grands Bois concession manager           |
| Teddy Okogo             | Bordamur Grands Bois staff manager                |

## **Odzala**

Philippe Mortier  
Conrad Aveling  
Djoni-Djimbi Bourges

PAPFFG, ex-CTC Project Coordinator (Feb05-Jun06)  
Chairman CTC, ex-ECOFAC Regional Coordinator  
Warden, Odzala Kokoua NP

## **Dja**

Jean Lagarde Betti

MINFOF Warden Dja Faunal Reserve and WH Site

## **GAMBA/CONKOUATI/MAYUMBA**

### **Gamba**

Bas Huijbregts

WWF Principal Technical Advisor, Gamba Programme

### **Conkouati-Douli**

Hilde Vanleeuwe  
Tim Collins  
Firmin Mahoungou  
Grégoire Bonassidi  
Philémon N.  
Abdon Bitsindou  
NN

WCS Conkouati Project Director  
WCS Regional Marine expert  
WCS Conkouati Project Logistics Officer  
MEFE Warden Conkouati Douli NP  
MEFE Assistant Warden Conkouati Douli NP  
WCS Conkouati Project Chef de Volet Ecologie  
Two members of the Marine Turtles Monitoring Team

## **TRI-NATIONAL SANGHA**

### **Dzanga Sangha**

David Greer  
Jean-Bernard Yarissem  
Cyril Péliissier  
Angelique Todd  
Roger Pechambou  
José Madomi  
Rubens Nambaï  
Michel Bonannée  
Jean-Baptiste Mamang  
Jean-Michel Borie  
Benoit Demarquès  
Christian Fargeaud  
Mathias Heinz  
Paul Tanga  
Josué Nambama  
Didier Sombo  
Robert Benzo  
Didier Ngaïna  
Andrea Turkalo

ex-WWF CT, now JGI Tshimpounga Chimpanzee Manager  
WWF Chargé de Programme RCA  
WWF Conseiller Technique Projet Dzanga Sangha  
WWF Ecotourism Officer, Max-Planck gorilla specialist  
WWF Finance and Administrative Manager  
Directeur National MEFCPE Projet Dzanga Sangha  
Point Focal RAPAC MEFCPE  
Chargé de Mission MEFCPE, Coordinateur Natl COMIFAC  
Conseiller MEFCPE  
MAE France Conseiller Technique MEFCPE  
Projet PARPAF AFD  
CIRAD Chef de Projet Viande de Brousse  
GTZ Chef de Projet Dzanga Sangha  
Sous Préfet District de Bayanga  
MEFCPE Warden, Dzanga-Sangha Complex  
Chargé de Discipline  
Commandant de Brigade  
Ecogarde  
WCS Elephant monitoring specialist

## **Nouabalé-Ndoki**

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Rémy Ledauphin    | WCS Nouabalé-Ndoki Project Director                  |
| Pierre Ngouembe   | MEFE Warden Nouabalé-Ndoki NP                        |
| Victor Mbolo      | MEFE Assistant Warden NNNP, ex-Odzala NP             |
| Rolland Abegouo   | WCS Ecotourism Officer                               |
| Hannah Thomas     | WCS NNNP & PROGEPP Monitoring Coordinator            |
| Patrick Boundja   | WCS NNNP Monitoring Officer                          |
| Patrice Mongo     | WCS Mondika Gorilla Research Coordinator             |
| Victor Mamonekene | University Brazzaville, TNS FFEM Fisheries Programme |

## **Lobéké**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Albert Mouna Aban       | MINFOF Lobéké NP Warden (ex-Dja FR Warden)       |
| Vincent Ngwane          | WWF Coordinator Libongo                          |
| Pial Metsele            | WWF Monitoring Officer Djembé                    |
| Oumar Abakar            | Assistant, Groupe SEFAC/SEBAC/FB, Libongo        |
| Mr Bonelli              | Chef de Chantier, Groupe SEFAC/SEBAC/FB, Libongo |
| Louis Ngono             | WWF Collaborative Management Officer, Mambélé    |
| Ephraim Ebong           | WWF Lobéké Anti poaching Assistant, Mambélé      |
| Jean-Paul Mahop         | WWF Training and Research Assistant, Mambélé     |
| Lucien Abagui           | Ecogarde, Chef de Section                        |
| Marie Solange Ngak Avom | Ecogarde, Technicienne des Eaux et Forêts        |
| Simon Pierre Mpouop     | Ecogarde   |
| Léonard Usongo          | WWF SE Cameroon Programme Coordinator            |
| Zacharie Nzoo           | WWF SE Cameroon Programme Officer                |
| Samuel Mbondo Mbondo    | WWF SE Cameroon Programme Finance Manager        |
| Antoine Ekodo           | WWF SE Cameroon Administrative Assistant         |
| Louis Defo              | WWF SE Cameroon Collaborative Management Advisor |
| Zacharie Defo           | WWF Chef de garage, Yokadouma                    |

### **Annex 3: List of documents and other reference materials consulted**

Anon 2006 : Statement from the partners for conservation of natural World Heritage sites to the World Heritage Committee and to the signatories of the Convention on Biological Diversity. 4pp. <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/news/documents/news-243-1.doc>

Anon 2006: La Tri National de la Sangha. Information folder.

Anon 2007a : Convention de collaboration pour la gestion durable de la faune sauvage de la Boumba et Ngoko. Amendement Convention de Mambélé. 10 mai 2007. 9pp.

Anon 2007b : Convention de collaboration pour la lutte contre le braconnage dans le territoire de l'Unité Technique Opérationnelle (UTO) Sud-Est. Amendement Convention de LAB. 12 mai 2007. 11pp.

Anon 2007c : The Sangha Tri-National Foundation. Information folder.

Bitsindou, A. 2006 : Rapport de monitoring sur les tortues marines au Parc National de Conkouati Douli. Saison 2005-2006. 11pp.

CAWHFI 2003: Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative Project document.

CAWHFI 2006a: Conclusions of the Technical Meeting of the Steering Committee. Libreville, 14 February 2006. 6pp.

CAWHFI 2006b: Report of the Steering Committee meeting. Libreville, 15-16 février 2006. 35pp. [http://www.cbfp.org/documents/meetings/atelier\\_cawhfi.pdf](http://www.cbfp.org/documents/meetings/atelier_cawhfi.pdf)

CAWHFI 2007a: Report of the Technical Meeting of the Steering Committee. Libreville, 19-20 March 2007. 8pp.

CAWHFI 2007b: Report of the annual Steering Committee meeting. Libreville, 21-22 March 2007. 95pp.

CBD 2004: Programme of Work on Protected Areas. Decision VII/28 - COP7. Kuala Lumpur. <http://www.cbd.int/protected/>; <http://www.cbd.int/decisions/?m=COP-07&id=7765&lg=0> ; <http://www.cbd.int/doc/meetings/pa/wscbpa-afr-01/official/wscbpa-afr-01-03-fr.doc>

Christy, P. 2002: Aires protégées de Dzanga-Sangha. WWF CARPO & GTZ. 61pp.

CNPN 2005 : Objectif global et objectifs spécifiques des parcs nationaux du Gabon. 1p.

COMIFAC 2005 : Opérationnalisation du Plan de Convergence de la COMIFAC : Plan d'Opérations 2006-2008. 190pp.

CTC 2006: CAWHFI Progress report. February 2005 – June 2006. Odzala-Kokoua NP. 45pp.

EoH 2007a: Enhancing our Heritage project website <http://www.enhancingheritage.net/about.htm> visited on 26 December 2007.

EoH 2007b: The World Heritage Management Effectiveness Workbook. 2007 Edition. 106pp.

FAO & WCS 2006: Contract n° TF/HQR/CPA 187428-2006/FORC between FAO and WCS. 12pp.

FFEM 2005: Conservation et gestion durable de la faune sauvage en périphérie des parcs nationaux du Bassin du Congo. Rapport de présentation au Comité de Pilotage. 25 novembre 2005. 130pp.

Gately, M. 2007: A Guide to the Nouabalé-Ndoki National Park. WCS. 41pp.

Hart, T. & Debonnet, G. 2007: Protecting tropical forest of global importance: the Central African landscape approach. *in*: World Heritage forests – Leveraging conservation at the landscape level. Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> WH Forests Meeting. Nancy, 9-11 March 2005. WH Reports n°21, pp. 117-123.



ICMM 2003: Position statement on Mining and Protected Areas. Website <http://www.icmm.com/publications/1120ICMMPositionStatementonMiningandProtectedAreas.pdf> visited on 4 January 2007.

IUCN 2007: IUCN as official technical advisory body to the World Heritage Committee on natural heritage. Website <http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wheritage/wheritageindex.htm> visited on 4 January 2007.

MEFE & WCS 2002: Plan d'aménagement du Parc National de Nouabalé-Ndoki 2003-2007. 183pp.

MINFOF 2006: Plan d'aménagement du Parc National de Lobéké et de sa zone périphérique. 2006-2010. 100pp.

MINFOF 2008 : Parc National de Lobéké : Plan de Travail Annuel 2008. Excel file.

MWH 2006: Evaluation opérationnelle et financière du programme ECOFAC 3 – Composante Parc National d'Odzala – Kokoua en République du Congo. Rapport de mission soumis à l'Union européenne. 124pp.

Nguingui, J.C. 2004 : Gouvernance des aires protégées dans le Bassin du Congo : principes et pratiques. In : *Tropical Forests in a Changing Global Context*. Royal Academy of Overseas Sciences. Brussels 8-9 November 2004. pp 127-137.

Paul, S. 2003: The appeal of World Heritage designation to funding agencies: Case of the UN Foundation. UNF paper presented at the Vth WPC. 3pp.  
[http://www.conservationfinance.org/Workshops\\_Conferences/WPC/WPC\\_documents/Apps\\_03\\_Paul\\_v2.pdf](http://www.conservationfinance.org/Workshops_Conferences/WPC/WPC_documents/Apps_03_Paul_v2.pdf)

Pélissier, C. 2007 : Dzanga-Sangha Project. Power Point presentation. WWF CAR.

PFBC 2006: Les forêts du Bassin du Congo: état des forêts 2006. 256pp.

PoWPA 2007 : web site ([www.protectedareas.org](http://www.protectedareas.org)) visited on 30 December 2007.

Projet Dzanga Sangha 2004 : Le pistage des gorilles à Bai Hokou. 32pp.

Projet Dzanga Sangha 2007 : Note de présentation du PDS. Comité de Pilotage, 2 mars 2007. 12pp.

RAPAC 2007: RAPAC web site ([www.rapac.org](http://www.rapac.org)) visited on 19 December 2007.

UNESCO 2005a: Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. 161pp. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines>

UNESCO 2005b: Integrated CAWHFI-FFEM Logical Framework. 5pp.

UNESCO 2005c: World Heritage at the Vth World Park Congress, Durban (S. Africa), 8-17 September 2003. Ed. M. Patry. World Heritage Center. WH Paper Series 16. 76pp.

UNESCO 2006a : Formats des comptes rendus technico-financier CAWHFI-UNF. 3pp.

UNESCO 2006b: CAWHFI Draft Communication Strategy. 3pp.

UNESCO 2007a: CAWHFI pages on World Heritage Centre web site <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/325> visited on 26 December 2007.

UNESCO 2007b: Tentative Lists of State Parties pages on World Heritage Centre web site visited on 1 January 2008. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/tentativelists/>

UNESCO 2007c: Major outputs of the CAWHFI workshop on priorities for Phase 2. Paris, 26-27 September 2007. 2pp.

UNESCO 2007d: Overview of the budget of the Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative. Excel Sheet. December 2007.

UNESCO 2007e: Summary of major CAWHFI achievements. Memo from WHC to UNFIP, September 2007. 2pp.

UNESCO & FAO 2006: CAWHFI Project Progress Report 2005. Report submitted to UNF/UNFIP. 19pp.

UNESCO & FAO 2007: CAWHFI Project Progress Report 2006. Report submitted to UNF/UNFIP. 36pp.

UNESCO & WWF 2006: Contract n° 3250022448 between UNESCO and WWF International. 10pp.

UNF 2003: Knowledge Gathering Workshop. Workshop Report on assessing the programmatic effectiveness of the UNF projects portfolio. Durban, 8-9 Sept 2003. 36pp.

UNF 2005: SWOT Analysis of UN/Conservation NGOs Partnerships for World Heritage. Background Document to the Second Knowledge Gathering Workshop (KGW2). Washington D.C., 25-26 May 2005. 10pp.

UNF & UNESCO 2004: CAWHFI Information flyer. 2pp.  
<http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/files/12098/10618379341CAWHFI.pdf/CAWHFI.pdf>

WCS 2005a: CAWHFI Progress report 2004/2005. Conkouati-Douli NP. 30pp.

WCS 2005b: CAWHFI Progress report 2004/2005. Mayumba NP and Iguela. 17pp.

WCS 2005c: CAWHFI Progress report 2004/2005 (22pp) and Workplan 2005/2006 (17pp). Nouabalé-Ndoki NP (TNS).

WCS 2006a: CAWHFI Progress report 2005/2006 (24pp) and Workplan 2006/2007 (17pp). Nouabalé-Ndoki NP (TNS).

WCS 2006b: CAWHFI Progress report 2005/2006 and Workplan 2006/2007. Conkouati-Douli NP. 16pp.

WCS 2007a: CAWHFI/FFEM Progress report Year 1. Conkouati-Douli NP. October 2007. 32pp.

WCS 2007b: CAWHFI/FFEM Progress report Year 1. TRIDOM/Odzala UFA Ngombé. March-August 2007. 8pp.

WCS 2007c: CAWHFI/FFEM Progress report Year 1. Projet promotion des moyens d'existence des semi-nomades. Nouabalé-Ndoki NP. March-September 2007. 17pp.

WCS 2007d: CAWHFI/FFEM Progress report Year 1. Projet de gestion durable des pêcheries au sein du TNS Sangha. October 2007. 7pp.

WWF 2006a: CAWHFI Progress report. July 2004 - March 2006. 11pp.

WWF 2006b: CAWHFI Progress report. January – December 2006. 10pp.

WWF 2007a: CAWHFI Progress report. April 2006 – June 2007. 55pp.

WWF 2007b: CAWHFI Year 3. Workplan Lobéké component. 2pp.

WWF 2007c: CAWHFI/FFEM Interim Technical Progress report Year 1. March – September 2007. 43pp.

#### Annex 4:

### INTEGRATED CA WHFI-FFEM LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

**VISION :** A NETWORK OF OUTSTANDING CLUSTERS OF PROTECTED AREAS AND NEW POTENTIAL WORLD HERITAGE SITES IN A WIDER FOREST LANDSCAPE WHOSE INTEGRITY IS MAINTAINED AND WHERE SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT OF NATURAL RESSOURCES, IN PARTICULAR WILDLIFE, CONSTITUTES AN EXAMPLE AND AN INSPIRATION FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF TROPICAL FOREST AREAS IN CENTRAL AFRICA AND ELSEWHERE.

#### **OVERALL OBJECTIVE :**

Improve sustainable management of forest landscapes of the Congo Basin, including clusters of protected areas of potential outstanding universal value, in supporting and promoting the development of protected area management regimes for Central Africa forests that will satisfy standards befitting World Heritage status.

#### **IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES:**

##### ***1. Improve the management of selected protected areas of potential outstanding universal value***

*1.1 Provide the protected areas with adequate staffing*

*1.2 Improve the park's management infrastructure and equipment*

*1.3 Build capacity to enable site-management to design, adopt and operate effective law enforcement regimes*

##### ***2. Improve natural resource management, particularly wildlife, in the forest landscape around selected protected areas of outstanding universal value***

*2.1 Strengthen institutional capacities to allow common based management of wildlife around protected areas.*

*2.2 Raise all stakeholder's awareness (government, private sector and local population) on the importance of sustainable wildlife management and on the role they can play in combating illegal hunting*

*2.3 Define wildlife management plans with all stakeholders for zones surrounding protected areas*

*2.4 Implementation and monitoring of wildlife management plans*

##### ***3. Use World Heritage image to improve protected area management and long-term conservation financing***

| <b>IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 1 : IMPROVE THE MANAGEMENT OF SELECTED PROTECTED AREAS OF POTENTIAL OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE</b> |   |
|--|---|
| <b>ACTIVITIES :</b>  |   |
| <b>1.1. PROVIDE THE PROTECTED AREA'S MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES WITH ADEQUATE STAFF</b>  | 1.1.1 Recruit, train and equip additional ecoguards   |
|  | 1.1.2 Provide adequate equipment and training to the existing PA staff  |
|  | 1.1.3 Support regular patrols of ecoguards in PAs and joint transborder operations within the forest landscape. |
| <b>1.2. IMPROVE THE PARK'S MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE AND EQUIPMENT</b>   | 1.2.1 Create additional patrol posts and housing in base camps.   |
|  | 1.2.2 Provide adequate transport (terrestrial & fluvial) and communication means                                |
|  | 1.2.3 Support maintenance of the site's infrastructure  |
| <b>1.3. BUILD CAPACITY TO ENABLE SITE-MANAGEMENT TO DESIGN, ADOPT AND OPERATE EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT REGIMES.</b>       | 1.3.1 Develop and implement monitoring systems and PA surveillance schemes                                      |
|  | 1.3.2 Develop a regional bushmeat trade monitoring system   |
|  | 1.3.2 Organize aerial surveillance  |

| <b>IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 2 : IMPROVE NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, PARTICULARLY WILDLIFE, AROUND PROTECTED AREAS</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2.1. STRENGTHEN INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES TO ALLOW COMMON BASED MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AROUND PAS</b>  | 2.1.1 Provide institutional support at the local level for the project's intervention sites  |
|  | 2.1.2 Provide institutional support at national and regional level on the topic of sustainable management of wildlife                                  |
|  | 2.1.3 Review protected area, forestry, hunting and other relevant laws and regulations to minimize contradictions and improve synergies.               |
|  | 2.1.4 Support the process of reviewing PA boundaries and their overlap with forest concessions.  |
|  | 2.1.5. Train stakeholders in conflict resolution techniques, facilitation and organizational empowerment as well as in wildlife management strategies. |
|  | 2.1.6. Contribute to CAWHFI's coordination program   |
| <b>2.2. RAISE ALL STAKEHOLDERS' AWARENESS (GOVERNMENT, PRIVATE SECTOR AND LOCAL POPULATION) ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SUSTAINABLE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AND ON THE ROLE THEY CAN PLAY IN COMBATING ILLEGAL HUNTING.</b> | 2.2.1. Undertake socio-economic studies and market assessments to understand the economics of bushmeat trade (e.g. supply chains)                      |
|  | 2.2.2. Organize workshops to raise local authorities' awareness on forest and wildlife conservation laws and regulations                               |
|  | 2.2.3. Facilitate support from and collaboration with local police forces.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2.2. RAISE ALL STAKEHOLDERS' AWARENESS (GOVERNMENT, PRIVATE SECTOR AND LOCAL POPULATION) ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SUSTAINABLE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AND ON THE ROLE THEY CAN PLAY IN COMBATING ILLEGAL HUNTING.</b> | 2.2.4. Raise awareness about health concerns associated with hunting and slaughter of selected wildlife species.  |
|  | 2.2.5. Set up education programs for local population and undertake conservation education campaign in local schools  |
|  | 2.2.6. Create incentives for widespread participation of all market operators and, in particularly women, to abide by bushmeat trade regulation.  |
|  | 2.2.7. Identify and promote alternative revenue generation mechanisms to minimize dependence of rural communities on bushmeat trade (e.g. micro-project targeting women and baka pygmies)             |
|  | 2.2.8. Encourage logging companies to integrate wildlife conservation policies and programs as part of their concession-management strategies   |
|  | 2.2.9. Provide incentives and mechanisms to encourage local communities to participate in law enforcement regimes for protected areas. (e.g. support local NGOs, organize intelligence network, etc.) |
| <b>2.3. DEFINE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT PLANS WITH ALL STAKEHOLDERS FOR ZONES SURROUNDING PROTECTED AREAS.</b>  | 2.3.1 Realize socio-economic and biology studies as a base-ground for de development of wildlife management plans   |
|  | 2.3.2 Organize a consultation process with and between all stakeholders concerned by hunting management   |
|  | 2.3.3 Negotiate conventions and agreements on wildlife management with stakeholders concerned by hunting management.  |
|  | 2.3.4 Based upon the conventions, establish wildlife management plans.  |
|  | 2.3.5 Develop sustainable financing mechanisms for the implementation of wildlife management plans.   |
| <b>2. 4. IMPLEMENT AND MONITOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT PLANS</b>   | 2.4.1 Develop, in collaboration with all stakeholders, a monitoring system that ensures correct implementation of the conventions and management plans.   |
|  | 2.4.2 Raise awareness of governmental stakeholders, private sector, and local populations on the content of the agreements and management plans.  |
|  | 2.4.3 According to the specific needs of each site, ensure adequate training of stakeholders for the implementation of the management plans.  |
|  | 2.4.4 Establish consultative plate-forms for information dissemination between all stakeholders of the project's intervention zones   |
|  | 2.4.5 Set up a wildlife management monitoring system in collaboration with all stakeholders   |
|  | 2.4.6 Experiment innovative hunting management mechanisms   |
|  | 2.4.7 Value semi-nomad communities' traditional wildlife management systems   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | 2.4.8 Develop alternative income generating activities in collaboration with the private sector (tourism, fisheries, agriculture and agroforestry, meat supply for forest concessions workers, etc.). |
|--|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 3 : USE WORLD HERITAGE IMAGE TO IMPROVE PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT AND LONG-TERM CONSERVATION FINANCING.</b>   |  |
| <b>3.1. USE ANNUAL SESSIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE AS A FORUM TO REPORT ON CAWHFI ACHIEVEMENTS AND CALL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL AND AFRICAN POLITICAL COMMITMENT TO THE ADOPTION AND REALIZATION OF YAOUNDÉ SUMMIT PRINCIPLES AND OTHER SUCH SUBREGIONAL AND REGIONAL (AFRICAN) INSTRUMENTS.</b> | 3.1.1 The Steering Committee submits CAWHFI's annual progress reports to the World Heritage Committee meetings.  |
|  | 3.1.2 Assist Yaoundé countries to prepare request for assistance from WH Fund support for the development of national tentative lists of WH sites.   |
|  | 3.1.3 Organize 3 national studies on PAs adequacy with criteria and conditions for WH listing as well as regional meetings for the preparation of harmonized submissions of new forest sites to WH List by Yaoundé countries |
| <b>3.2. BUILD UN-CONSERVATION NGO PARTNERSHIPS AND ENCOURAGE WORKING ARRANGEMENTS TO PROMOTE WORLD HERITAGE STATUS TO A SELECTED NUMBER OF CENTRAL AFRICAN PROTECTED AREA COMPLEXES FOR THE CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY.</b>  | 3.2.1 Work out collaborative arrangements on roles and responsibilities of each partner (CAWHFI Steering Committee)  |
|  | 3.2.2 Test and develop CAWHFI coordination mechanism as a model for similar UN-conservation NGO partnerships.  |
| <b>3.3. ENSURE FINANCING OF CAWHFI DURING THE 4-YEAR PERIOD AND EXPLORE POSSIBILITIES FOR LONG TERM FINANCING OF CENTRAL AFRICAN BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION THROUGH INNOVATIVE ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN UNF, CONSERVATION NGOS AND OTHER POTENTIAL DONORS.</b>  | 3.3.1 NGOs and UNF develop and finalize their co-funding arrangements  |
|  | 3.3.2 Attract additional donors and finalize new funding arrangements  |
|  | 3.3.3 Support CAWHFI partners with design and development of site-based Trust Funds.   |

## **Annex 5: IUCN WPC Recommendation V.21 - The World Heritage Convention**

The UNESCO World Heritage Convention is an important instrument of international cooperation to protect and transmit to future generations the world's outstanding natural and/or cultural heritage. The global coverage of World Heritage extends across 129 countries with a total of 754 sites on the World Heritage List (582 cultural, 149 natural and 23 mixed sites).

World Heritage sites deserve the highest possible standards of protection and conservation and provide leadership in protected area management.

In addition to a number of prominent conservation success stories, there have been several important advances in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention over the past 30 years including:

- a. The development of thematic studies on key biomes as part of a World Heritage Global Strategy to fill gaps in the World Heritage List;
- b. Recognition of outstanding linkages between people and the environment with the inclusion of cultural landscapes and mixed sites on the World Heritage List;
- c. Greater understanding that many World Heritage sites have traditional, sacred and spiritual values;
- d. Greater use of innovative approaches to World Heritage conservation including serial and transboundary sites;
- e. The development of a Global Training Strategy for World Heritage; and
- f. Added momentum for the Convention's role in conserving biodiversity particularly through existing and new partnerships and the significant financial support of the United Nations Foundation.

However, the current World Heritage List continues to have significant gaps in its coverage of the world's key terrestrial, freshwater and marine biomes of outstanding universal value. There are also a number of World Heritage sites that are 'In Danger', and many others face serious threats and management challenges. War and lack of security are particularly intractable causes in some regions.

### **Therefore, PARTICIPANTS in the Cross-cutting Theme on World Heritage at the V<sup>th</sup> IUCN World Parks Congress in Durban, South Africa (8–17 September 2003):**

1. DECLARE their wholehearted support for the World Heritage Convention as a highly effective international instrument, which provides invaluable international reinforcement for local, national and regional efforts to protect the world's outstanding natural and cultural heritage;
2. ENCOURAGE countries that have not yet joined the World Heritage Convention to do so at the earliest opportunity;
3. NOTE with appreciation the action of the International Council on Mining and Metals and Shell in declaring that they will treat World Heritage sites as 'no-go' areas for their exploration and extractive activities and call on all other members of the mining, oil and gas industries to make the same commitment;
4. CALL ON the international community to give special protection to World Heritage sites in regions affected by war and civil unrest;
5. URGE the international community, including the private sector, to recognise and respect World Heritage sites for their international legal status and for their global significance to this and future generations, ensuring in particular that they do not promote or support activities that threaten them;
6. CALL on the World Heritage Committee, the States Parties, the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, IUCN (and the other Advisory Bodies, the International Council on Monuments and Sites and the

International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property, as appropriate) to:

- a. COMPLETE the assessment of potential World Heritage natural sites around the world, giving priority to the identification and nomination of outstanding natural and cultural heritage in key terrestrial, freshwater and marine biomes;
  - b. FURTHER SUPPORT work to identify outstanding places that may merit consideration for World Heritage nomination;
  - c. ENCOURAGE the preparation of regionally harmonised lists of potential World Heritage sites;
  - d. ENSURE that all sites of outstanding universal value are nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List and ensure that all stakeholders with relevant expertise are able to participate in the process;
  - e. PROMOTE the identification, nomination and protection of World Heritage serial and transboundary sites and large biological corridors, Biosphere Reserves or other bioregional scale initiatives to include World Heritage areas;
  - f. REINFORCE the goals of the World Heritage Convention, namely the governance, effective management and conservation of World Heritage sites by:
    - i. Involving local expertise in all World Heritage activities;
    - ii. Establishing appropriate public, private and community partnerships for the benefit of the local communities living in and around World Heritage sites;
    - iii. Enhancing standards of protection and monitoring;
    - iv. Strengthening national and international commitment for their conservation and monitoring;
    - v. Mobilising additional financial and technical resources for priority measures; and
    - vi. Building capacity at national and local levels;
  - g. WORK WITH governments, civil society, and the private sector to demonstrate how World Heritage status can contribute to effective partnerships between global, national and local stakeholders to ensure environmental, economic and social benefits within and beyond the boundaries of World Heritage sites; and
  - h. RECOGNISE and PROMOTE the special status of World Heritage sites at the national and international level to lever additional resources for conservation for these sites and the broader system of protected areas;
7. URGE the global donor community to follow the leadership given by the UN Foundation and to consider giving greater special support to World Heritage sites in recognition of their outstanding universal value to present and future generations; and
  8. CALL on UNESCO, secretariats of other multilateral environmental agreements and IUCN, to seek further international, regional and national synergies and integration between the work of the World Heritage Convention and other regional and international conventions dealing with terrestrial and marine biodiversity and protected areas, in particular the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. Possibilities for joint work programmes to benefit World Heritage conservation should be explored.



**Annex 6: Excerpt from the *Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO 2005c)**

**Management systems**

**108.** Each nominated property should have an appropriate management plan or other documented management system which should specify how the outstanding universal value of a property should be preserved, preferably through participatory means.

**109.** The purpose of a management system is to ensure the effective protection of the nominated property for present and future generations.

**110.** An effective management system depends on the type, characteristics and needs of the nominated property and its cultural and natural context. Management systems may vary according to different cultural perspectives, the resources available and other factors. They may incorporate traditional practices, existing urban or regional planning instruments, and other planning control mechanisms, both formal and informal.

**111.** In recognizing the diversity mentioned above, common elements of an effective management system could include:

- a) a thorough shared understanding of the property by all stakeholders;
- b) a cycle of planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and feedback;
- c) the involvement of partners and stakeholders;
- d) the allocation of necessary resources;
- e) capacity-building; and
- f) an accountable, transparent description of how the management system functions.

**112.** Effective management involves a cycle of long-term and day-to-day actions to protect, conserve and present the nominated property.

**113.** Moreover, in the context of the implementation of the *Convention*, the World Heritage Committee has established a process of Reactive Monitoring (...) and a process of Periodic Reporting (...).

**114.** In the case of serial properties, a management system or mechanisms for ensuring the co-ordinated management of the separate components are essential and should be documented in the nomination (...).

**115.** In some circumstances, a management plan or other management system may not be in place at the time when a property is nominated for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee. The State Party concerned should then indicate when such a management plan or system would be put in place, and how it proposes to mobilize the resources required for the preparation and implementation of the new management plan or system. The State Party should also provide other document(s) (e.g. operational plans) which will guide the management of the site until such time when a management plan is finalized.

**116.** Where the intrinsic qualities of a property nominated are threatened by action of man and yet meet the criteria and the conditions of authenticity or integrity set out in paragraphs 78-95, an action plan outlining the corrective measures required should be submitted with the nomination file. Should the corrective measures submitted by the nominating State Party not be taken within the time proposed by the State Party, the property will be considered by the Committee for delisting in accordance with the procedure adopted by the Committee (...).

**117.** States Parties are responsible for implementing effective management activities for a World Heritage property. State Parties should do so in close collaboration with property managers, the agency with management authority and other partners, and stakeholders in property management.

**118.** The Committee recommends that States Parties include risk preparedness as an element in their World Heritage site management plans and training strategies.

## Annex 7: Administrative requirements for annual transfers of funds: the case of WWF

| Between   |               | Action  | condition  |
|-----------|---------------|---|--|
| WWF US    | WWF Intl      | Agreement on pooling resources  | Contract WWF US - WWF Intl   |
| WWF US    | UNF           | Transfer matching funds on UNF books  | Framework contract WWF US - UNF  |
| UNF       | UNFIP         | Transfer UNF + matching funds   |  |
| UNFIP     | UNESCO        | Transfer UNF funds  | Financial and progress reports for previous year;  |
| UNFIP     | WWF CARPO     | Transfer matching funds   |  |
| UNESCO    | WWF CARPO     | Transfer approximately 40 % UNF funds as a first installment (of 3) upon signature of contract, according to contract | Two financial and progress reports for previous year;<br>Meet the Contracting Committee deadlines;<br>Annual work plans, budget breakdown, letter of agreement (cf project document pt. 3.2.2) |
| WWF CARPO | Field offices | Transfer respective budgets per site as per funds received.   | Project and financial report   |

Source: UNESCO/WHC and WWF-CARPO, pers. comm.

### *Sequence for contract approval, signature and payment release:*

1. NGOs prepare workplan for Year +1
2. UNESCO/FAO elaborate draft contract Year +1
3. NGO send matching funds to UNF
4. UNESCO/FAO asks for cash replenishment
5. Contracts approved by Contract Committee (UNESCO)
6. Contracts issued by UNESCO and signed by NGO
7. NGO sends all documents for first payment
8. Payment released to NGO HQ – and transferred to the field

Source: CAWHFI 2007a

## Annex 8 : the 33 RAPAC “pilot sites” and presence of partners

| RAPAC Pilot Sites *                           |                      | Partners |        |       |       | Area (ha) |
|---|----------------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|-----------|
|   |                      | ECOFAc   | CAWHFI | CARPE | OTHER |           |
| <b>Cameroun</b>                               |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Réserve de Biosphère du Dja                | IBA RB SPM TRIDOM L4 | x        | x      | x     | x     | 526 000   |
| 2. Parc national de Lobéké                    | IBA TNS L5           |          | x      | x     | x     | 217 854   |
| 3. Parc national de Campo-Ma'an               | IBA                  |          |        |       | x     | 264 064   |
| 4. Parc national de Mbam et Djerem            | IBA                  |          |        |       | x     | 125 000   |
| 5. Parc national de Korup                     | IBA                  |          |        |       | x     | 125 900   |
| 6. Parc national de la Bénoué                 | IBA RB               |          |        |       |       | 180 000   |
| 7. Parc national de Waza                      | IBA RAM RB           |          |        |       |       | 170 000   |
| <b>Congo</b>                                  |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Parc national d'Odzala-Kokoua              | IBA RB TRIDOM L4     | x        | x      | x     | x     | 1 354 600 |
| 2. Parc national de Nouabalé-Ndoki            | IBA TNS L5           |          | x      | x     | x     | 386 592   |
| 3. Réserve communautaire du Lac Télé          | IBA L7               |          |        | x     |       | 438 960   |
| <b>Gabon</b>                                  |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Parc national de la Lopé                   | IBA SPM L3           | x        |        | x     | x     | 491 291   |
| 2. Parc national de Minkébé                   | IBA TRIDOM L4        |          | x      | x     | x     | 756 000   |
| 3. Parc national de Loango                    | IBA RAM L2           |          | x      | x     | x     | 155 224   |
| 4. Parc national d'Akanda                     | IBA RAM              |          |        |       | x     | 53 780    |
| <b>Guinée Equatoriale</b>                     |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Parc national de Monte Alén                | IBA L1               | x        |        | x     |       | 200 000   |
| 2. Réserve naturelle de Corisco e Elobeyes    |                      |          |        |       |       | 53 000    |
| 3. Parc national de los Altos de Nsork        | IBA                  |          |        |       |       | 70 000    |
| 4. Réserve scientifique de la Caldera de Luba | IBA                  |          |        |       |       | 51 000    |
| 5. Réserve naturelle de Rio Campo             |                      |          |        |       |       | 33 000    |
| 6. Réserve naturelle de Rio Muni              |                      |          |        |       |       | 60 000    |
| <b>République Centrafricaine</b>              |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Complexe Bamingui- Bangoran/Vassako Bolo   | IBA RB               |          |        |       |       | 1 156 000 |
| 2. Parc national Dzanga-Ndoki                 | IBA TNS L5           |          | x      | x     | x     | 120 000   |
| 3. Parc national Manovo- Gounda- Saint Floris | IBA SPM              | x        |        |       |       | 1 740 000 |
| <b>République Démocratique du Congo</b>       |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Parc national de la Salonga                | IBA SPM L8           | x        |        | x     | x     | 3 656 000 |
| 2. Parc national des Virunga                  | IBA RAM SPM L12      |          |        | x     | x     | 780 000   |
| 3. Réserve de faune à Okapi                   | IBA SPM L11          |          |        | x     | x     | 1 372 625 |
| 4. Réserve de Biosphère de la Luki            | IBA RB               |          |        |       | x     | 33 000    |
| 5. Parc national de la Garamba                | IBA SPM              |          |        |       | x     | 492 000   |
| 6. Parc national de la Maiko                  | IBA L10              |          |        | x     |       | 1 083 000 |
| 7. Parc national du Kahuzi-Biega              | IBA SPM L10          |          |        | x     | x     | 600 000   |
| <b>São Tomé et Príncipe</b>                   |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Parc national de Obô                       | IBA                  | x        |        |       |       | 29 500    |
| <b>Tchad</b>                                  |                      |          |        |       |       |           |
| 1. Parc national de Zakouma                   | IBA                  | x        |        |       | x     | 305 000   |
| 2. Réserve de faune de Binder-Léré            | IBA RAM              |          |        |       | x     | 135 000   |

\* IBA : Important Bird Area (*sensu* BirdLife) ; RAM : Ramsar Site ; RB : Biosphere Reserve; SPM : World Heritage Site ; Lx : Landscape CBFP n°x ;

## Annex 9 : Map of CAWHFI landscapes and sites

