

The Global Environment Facility in Central Africa

A desk-based review of the treatment of indigenous peoples' and social issues in a sample of 14 biodiversity projects

Emily Caruso
Forest Peoples Programme

March 2005

1 Purpose of the briefing

As part of a wider FPP review of GEF biodiversity policies and projects¹, this briefing analyses the project documents of 14 of the GEF's biodiversity projects in Central Africa to evaluate how social and indigenous peoples' issues were treated in project design. The evaluation examined the treatment of 6 criteria in the project documents: indigenous peoples, traditional knowledge, safeguard policies, restrictions on resource use, relocation and baseline studies. The following section of the briefing provides a short analysis of these and a more in-depth analysis of 5 selected current projects. Annex 1 contains a table of the data used in the analysis. Annex 2 contains a list of current GEF biodiversity projects in Central Africa.

2 Desk-based analysis of selected GEF projects:

Quantitative analysis of some GEF Central Africa biodiversity projects²

A quantitative analysis of 14 Central African GEF project documents³ was carried out in order to understand how GEF project documents for Central African biodiversity projects treated social and cultural issues, and, where the data was available, what broad proportion of the budget was allocated to addressing such issues (See Annex 1). Initial findings were as follows:

- *Indigenous Peoples:* Although all projects have the potential to impact indigenous peoples living in these countries, 8 project documents did not mention indigenous peoples or pygmies, while 8 project documents did not invoke any human rights.
- *Traditional Knowledge:* Only 3 out of the 14 project documents examined mention traditional or indigenous knowledge, and each of these 3 documents mention it only once. One of the 3 project documents notes that it should be "promoted" within the project, while the other two note that it can be taken into account in project implementation.

¹ Griffiths, T (2005) *Indigenous Peoples and the Global Environment Facility: Indigenous Peoples' experiences of GEF-funded Biodiversity Conservation – a critical study*, Forest Peoples Programme, UK

² Please refer to Annex 1 for the details concerning these projects

³ The project documents reviewed were for closed, current and pipeline projects from the following countries: Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Uganda, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Gabon, and Regional projects.

- *Safeguard Policies*: The World Bank is the implementing agency for 8 of the projects reviewed, and yet safeguard policies are only invoked in 4 of these projects, with only 2 of these having prepared Indigenous Peoples Development Plans. Only one of the UNDP-implemented projects refers to the UNDP's Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.
- *Restrictions on resource use*: The majority of the project documents reviewed promote the 'alternative livelihoods' approach, which indicates that restrictions on resource use will be implemented and some refer directly to restrictions being placed on communities with regards to access and resource use.
- *Relocation*: Three of the project documents reviewed refer directly to relocation of communities in relation to protected areas, and another two do not rule it out (i.e. note that measures will be taken should resettlement occur). One of the projects notes that a resettlement plan will be prepared for the affected communities (Uganda Protected Areas and Sustainable Use project).
- *Baseline studies*: Only one of the project documents reviewed specifically notes the preparation of baseline studies, including social assessments, prior to project implementation.

Budget analysis was not possible for many of the projects reviewed below, since the project documents do not disclose detailed budgets.

Specific analysis of some GEF Central Africa projects (see Annex 2 for project details)

Cameroon: FESAC⁴

The **Cameroon Forest and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit (FESAC)**, approved in May 2004, is the new version of the original Programme Sectoriel Environnement et Forêts (PSFE). The development objective of the FESAC is to “*strengthen public and private efforts to achieve socio-economically and ecologically sustainable use of national forest and wildlife resources*”. Five programme components will be implemented under the FESAC⁵:

1. *Regulation and environment information management*: to deal with updating and refining the sector's regulatory framework, and with creating instruments for environmental monitoring.
2. *Management of Production Forests*: to enact management plans and monitor their implementation in all commercial forests
3. *Management of Protected Areas and Wildlife*: will include, amongst others, biodiversity planning and zoning, participatory protected area and hunting zone management, design and implementation of PA management plans, legal and institutional reform of protected areas and hunting zones management, etc.
4. *Management of Community Forests*: will include management of community forests, “revenue generating tree planting schemes (...) in particular (...) to attract potential carbon finance partners”, and organisation of community-based fuelwood cooperatives & fuelwood markets.
5. *Institutional strengthening, training and research*: will include restructuring the National Agency for Forest Development, and strengthening the Ministry for Environment.

⁴ Project documents can be found at www.worldbank.org

⁵ For further details concerning the projects objectives, activities, outcomes, etc see GEF (2004) *Cameroon: Forestry and Environmental Sector Adjustment Credit – GEF Brief*. Available at www.gefonline.org

The FESAC project document (PD) notes that Pygmy peoples are an important and often marginalised section of society in Cameroon, and that their issues require specific attention. It contains a full half-page section on the “special case of the Pygmy populations” and that it will strengthen their “customary and modern rights and the voice of Pygmies in the decision-making and forest management process”. This is not followed up by specific measures or mechanisms to ensure this, and it is unclear how this claim will be implemented in practice. The PD contains a strong section on the importance of participation, and yet the only measures taken so far have been to carry out 10 regional workshops. These cannot be sufficient, given Pygmies’ lack of representation, and the weak capacities of their support organisations, and cannot be considered culturally appropriate in most cases, in light of Pygmy communities’ forest-based livelihoods, lack of access to formal education, and their socio-political marginalisation. Specific measures to enable indigenous participation in decision-making are necessary.

Under the original Programme Sectoriel Forêts et Environnement, an Indigenous Peoples Development Plan was prepared⁶. According to the IPDP, it is clear that “only the full implementation of the IPDP and all its components fulfils the requirements of the OD 42.0, guarantees that the PSFE respects the rights, dignity and culture of the indigenous people, offers them equal or better opportunities to participate in the benefits and achieves the development objective of the PSFE”. Without specific safeguard measures established under the project, there is a serious risk that Pygmy peoples will be by-passed by the programme, and not consulted about forest management plans to be elaborated under FESAC. This will contribute to their increasing marginalisation and impoverishment, especially for the vast majority who rely upon forests for their livelihoods. The IPDP includes provisions for legally recognising indigenous settlements, establishing community forests and/or communal hunting zones for all IP communities, ameliorating forest law to ensure IP land use is legally settled, and establishing a national policy on indigenous peoples. Future processes linked to the IPDP should be based upon consultation with indigenous communities from all over the southern forest zone in line with existing safeguard policies as well as the spirit of IPDP proposals.

Despite some positive language of participation and sustainable development for forest dependent communities in project documents, the PD shows that the GEF has not moved away from a ‘the people are the problem’ position, and that the progressive language found in the descriptive portion of the document and the IPDP is barely echoed in the sections dealing with concrete activities. Thus, despite there being a substantial section on the importance of including indigenous peoples in project design and implementation, a lengthy table in Addendum 9 A of the PD have placed poaching and ‘subsistence resource use’ as among the most important pressures on the ecosystems of Cameroon⁷. According to the project, the main solution to this ‘pressure’ exerted by local communities is, as ever, to put in place alternative livelihood options and ‘economic incentives’ to take people away from allegedly ‘unsustainable’ practices. This approach is also reflected in the choice of “results and indicators” for project monitoring for tranche release⁸, which revolve entirely adoption of management plans, PAs gazetted, number of illegalities detected, etc. There is not one real community or people-based indicator in the entire table. This reflects a general trend in conservation projects elaborated in Central Africa over the past decade, often resulting in increased forest law enforcement. This is harmful to the livelihoods of indigenous communities relying upon forests, and it is often accompanied by the introduction, without consultation or community participation, of inappropriate alternative livelihood schemes that almost always fail to deliver benefits to communities.

⁶ available at www.worldbank.org/projects/

⁷ Interestingly, the problems of poaching are mentioned more than 2 times more often and in greater detail than issues relating to community or indigenous peoples’ rights.

⁸ pages 84-87 of the Project Document

As mentioned above, the GEF has started to emphasise the importance of the landscape approach in its recent projects. The FESAC project document, for example, notes that South Cameroon's zoning plan (which was established under the auspices of the GEF's Biodiversity and Management Plan 1993 – 2000) "...facilitates the implementation of a landscape approach integrating biodiversity conservation, forest and wildlife sustainable use and agriculture into 'Ecosystem Units'. These integrate ZIC and ZICS (privately or community-managed game reserves), UTOs (units comprising forest concessions and adjacent parks) and UFA (Forest concessions to me managed as indivisible units)."⁹ Efforts to involve local communities in the elaboration or management of these zones in other GEF projects in Cameroon have failed because they have completely marginalised Baka Pygmy communities, even when they were in the majority population in the forests being zoned¹⁰. The fundamental design applied by the project document, masked by progressive language, thus appears flawed, despite the assertions of participation and empowerment.

DRC: Support to the Rehabilitation of Protected Areas

In 1997, the UNDP/GEF project "Rehabilitation of Protected Areas in the DRC" was approved but its implementation was stalled from 1999-2004 due to political instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo¹¹. This project is now due to be revived, alongside the implementation of *another* GEF project entitled "**Support to the Rehabilitation of Protected Areas in DRC**", which was approved in April 2004. The latter project is to be implemented by the World Bank (whose contribution is USD 10M) with additional funding from other international donors for support to the Biodiversity Sub-Programme of the National Forest and Biodiversity Sector Programme (PNFC).

The project preparation (PDF B) component for "Support to the Rehabilitation of Protected Areas" was set in motion in mid-2004, and is expected to start soon.

The overarching objective of the World Bank/GEF project is to "rehabilitate long-term institutional capacity to manage and monitor DRC's national network of protected areas" (p 6 of the 2004 project concept note). The project's 2 components are:

- A. To support institutional rehabilitation through, amongst others: training; equipment and infrastructure; revitalisation of the personnel; improving capacity to manage staff, financial resources and physical assets; guide policy and communicate with outsiders; and establish a harmonised system for planning, monitoring and evaluation of activities and outcomes.
- B. To provide support to selected sites – the project will support 5 priority areas for the next five years.

⁹ GEF (2004) *Cameroon: Forest and Environment Sectoral Adjustment Credit*, GEF – p.

¹⁰ eg. the GEF Biodiversity and Conservation Management Project implemented in Campo Ma'an, Boumba Bek and Lobéké protected areas. [Project Document: GEF (2004) *Cameroon Biodiversity Conservation and Management*. – available from <http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=85>). More information on the problems associated with zoning can be found in issues 70 and 73 of the World Rainforest Movement (WRM) Bulletin, available at <http://www.wrm.org.uy/>, as well as in Nelson, J & Hossack, L (2003) *Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas in Africa*. Forest Peoples Programme.

¹¹ The Government Endorsement Letter of 17th of December 2002 for the UNDP/GEF Rehabilitation of Protected Areas project notes that the ultimate conservation objective in the DRC is to designate at least 15% of the national territory as protected areas.

According to the information available in project documents, no social or poverty assessments have been carried out, nor have proper social, economic, environmental and cultural baseline studies been undertaken with indigenous and forest-dependent peoples. Furthermore, there is no detailed budget available for the project, so community development budgetary provisions are not known at this stage.

This project also promotes the adoption of a landscape approach for all conservation activities in the DRC. It notes in one instance that the target situation in the DRC with regards to site level protected area management is to have, amongst others, protected area buffer zones “under participatory community management in consistency with the landscape approach”¹². This suggests that in this case, the landscape approach closely resembles more traditional approaches to protected areas, where core zones are reserved for strict protection, while buffer zones can be managed in a ‘participatory’ manner with the communities.

The project document also notes that the ultimate objective for the restoration of protected areas in the DRC is to ensure that protected areas can provide national and international environmental services¹³ such as tourism, scientific research and others. It does not specifically note that carbon sequestration is among such environmental services, although region-wide forest initiatives such as the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (see above) do promote such initiatives in the region.

Although the project document mentions the need to integrate conservation activities with poverty alleviation and community development activities, there remain worrying elements for indigenous peoples. There is no mention of indigenous peoples, let alone provision of safeguards for the recognition or respect of their rights. Local communities get a brief mention in the context of participation.

As noted by an Office Memorandum of the 14th of May 2004, “one of the key activities and outcomes of the GEF alternative [under this project] is the setting up of partnerships with private operators for sustainable management of game reserves and forest concessions adjacent to parks”¹⁴. This reflects a growing trend in the privatisation of conservation, which is likely to become increasingly common in the developing world, where innovative financing systems are sought for conservation. Once a protected area is privatised it is not at all clear what mechanisms for accountability and indigenous peoples’ rights will exist.

The project is now underway, and on paper appears to lack many of the fundamental requirements to ensure forest-dependent peoples do not lose out from the imposition of conservation priorities.

Rwanda: Integrated Management of Critical Ecosystems

The ***Rwanda Integrated Management of Critical Ecosystems*** project aims to “promote the conservation and sustainable management of ecosystems that play a critical role in rural livelihoods and harbour a variety of biological resources of high global value”. Its four main activities will be: (i) development of a sound policy and regulatory environment for sustainable integrated ecosystem management; (ii) capacity building and institutional strengthening at the central and local levels, including the creation of a Biodiversity Information System (BIS); (iii) development and implementation of community-based integrated ecosystem management plans, and (iv) monitoring and evaluation of the activities and dissemination of lessons learned and best practices.

¹² Page 11 of the project document

¹³ pages 14 and 20 of the project document

¹⁴ This can be found on www.gefonline.org under the Democratic Republic of Congo’s project page.

Although the project initially seems to focus on conservation of wetlands in order to sustain the livelihoods dependent on them, its key performance indicator for the project is the number of “critical wetlands that are designated as protected areas”. This is followed by the various project components which would promote alternative livelihood and income generating exercises which would create an “incentive system” to keep them out of the wetlands. As indicated by the budget, 25% of which will go to the “promotion of commercial agriculture”, the underlying design of the project is therefore seemingly geared towards removing people from the land they live on and derive a livelihood from.

Similarly to the other projects reviewed, there have been no social or poverty assessments, and there appear to be no social, economic and cultural baseline studies to understand who uses these wetlands and how, in order to understand potential consequences and impacts on local communities.

The project does, however, seem to take participation of local communities more seriously, and it would be important to follow up its implementation in Rwanda to understand whether the communities feel they have genuinely had a voice in the decision-making concerning the project.

Uganda: PA Management & Sustainable Use (PAMSU)

The main objective of the ***Uganda Protected Area Management and Sustainable Use*** project is the “sustainable and cost-effective management of Uganda’s wildlife and cultural resources”. This is to be carried out by four implementing agencies, each of which has a different role:

1. *Uganda Wildlife Authority*: Maintain cost-effective and efficient wildlife management inside & outside Protected Areas
2. *Uganda Wildlife Education Center*: Public awareness and knowledge in environmental and conservation issues created
3. *Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry*: Develop the framework for the tourism sector of the economy to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the protection of environmental and cultural values
4. *Department of Antiquities and Museums*: The Cultural Heritage of Uganda preserved

The project has a resettlement component. Although the Protected Areas System Plan, which is the result of a project-funded PA assessment in Uganda, “avoided significant issues of resettlement” in 22 out of 25 protected areas, the redrawing of boundaries of the Mt Elgon National Park, Katonga Game Reserve and the Pian Upe Wildlife Reserve will entail resettlement. Although the PAMSU project will “provide funds to engage a team of consultants to review and design appropriate plans to address the specific issues of people resident in the protected areas”, the resettlement component will not be financed under this project though, but under a separate Bank-funded activity. According to the project document it will be “fully consistent with World Bank Safeguard Policies”. This component of the project goes against international law and best practice in protected areas management¹⁵. It is disturbing that the GEF is considering providing funding for such a project considering the negative social impacts that have resulted from previous resettlement exercises elsewhere.

¹⁵ IUCN 2003, *Durban Accord and Durban Action Plan*, outcomes of the World Parks Congress and the CBD COP7 Decision VII/15.

Under the social component of the project¹⁶, the project document states that the Protected Areas System Plan will be beneficial to communities living in and around protected areas through the “[reduction in] conflicts between park authorities and local communities over boundaries and resource use”. This will be put into effect by establishing the “Parliamentary approved and agreed boundaries for the protected areas estate”, which will allow for clear demarcation of where the local population can and cannot legitimately use the resources. The only reassurance given by the project document with regards to the above is that the “process for establishing the new [protected area] system was a highly participatory process”.¹⁷

The project purports to benefit a great many diverse entities, and among them, communities feature, as they will benefit from “greater exposure to income generation opportunities, particularly for women’s groups who can sell crafts and cultural experiences”. The project aims to provide capacity building to local and indigenous communities “through innovative mechanisms to *involve* them in protected area and wildlife management” (emphasis added). As mentioned above, the loose terminology of involvement is not satisfactory to ensure genuine and meaningful participation of affected communities. Nevertheless, the project document states that a department for community conservation has been established under the Uganda Wildlife Authority and that collaborative management pilots will be funded under the project¹⁸. There is no project budget available in the project document, so scrutiny of the proportional expenditure on community development was not possible.

The project document contains a few other worrying aspects. There have been no social or poverty assessments done under the project, even though the risks are high. It maintains that no World Bank Safeguard Policies apply to the project, despite the contrary being asserted elsewhere concerning the resettlement component. Furthermore, it does not mention indigenous or local communities in the section entitled “Possible Controversial Aspects”, even though past GEF projects in protected areas in Uganda and elsewhere in Africa have been highly controversial.

Regional: the TRIDOM Project

The **Tri-national Dja-Odzala-Mikébé project** is a protected area project to be implemented in the area (“Inter-zone”) shared by Gabon, Cameroon and the Republic of Congo¹⁹. It has been selected as one of the eleven priority areas of the Congo Basin Forest Partnership (see below for further information). The specific objective of the project is “to maintain the ecological functions and connectivity of TRIDOM, and ensure long-term conservation of its protected area system through integrated, sustainable and participatory management in the interzone between the protected areas”. This project will also implement a ‘landscape approach’ to conservation and sustainable use.

Similar to the majority of GEF projects in Central Africa, the project’s rationale is still based on the premise that people are the problem, and the provision of “alternative livelihoods initiatives to ease the pressure on natural resources” (p.6) is, as ever, the golden solution. One of the main thrusts of the project is the “enforcement” of legislation concerning hunting and resource use. The project will even support mobile teams to carry out law enforcement throughout protected areas and forest concessions. This carries serious risks for indigenous peoples who rely on forest resources for their subsistence, and

¹⁶ p 22 of World Bank (2002) *Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use Project (PAD)*. Available at www.worldbank.org

¹⁷ p.23 op.cit. footnote 21

¹⁸ p 23 op. cit. footnote 21

¹⁹ GEF (2004) *Conservation of Transboundary Biodiversity in the Minkébé-Odzala-Dja Inter-zone in Gabon, Congo, and Cameroon: Project Brief*, GEF (available at <http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1095>)

who have in the past been victims of repressive and violent law enforcement at the hands of protected area and forest concession staff. This is especially true for Pygmy communities, whose cultural attachment to their forests and their dependence on subsistence hunting and gathering makes them extremely vulnerable to the enforcement of hunting control measures established to target commercial operators.

Another important element of this project, which highlights an increasing trend within the GEF, is that of promoting ecotourism as a financing mechanism for protected areas. This, despite the complete failure of other conservation and GEF projects to deliver the results expected from the key assumption that ecotourism will help protect biodiversity (eg, the Biodiversity Conservation and Management Project in Cameroon, implemented in Campo Ma'an and Lobéké national parks – see footnote 10). This, alongside the use of carbon forestry²⁰ (a feature of the Cameroon FESAC project and also increasingly discussed within COMIFAC), shows an increasing interest by policymakers and project managers in the financial value of 'ecosystem services', and how to capitalise on them. These commercial components of the project have not been agreed by communities who will be directly affected by them in Cameroon, Gabon or the Republic of Congo. This push for privatising or commercialising natural processes and areas thus threatens to exacerbate further the marginalisation of indigenous and forest-dependent peoples, since their territories and resources will be put on a market where actors are much more powerful than them, and even less accountable to them than their own government.

The project document notes that TRIDOM will seek to address the needs of indigenous peoples in particular "by (1) encouraging increased participation of pygmies in the decision-making process regarding natural resources, in particular during land-use planning exercise and (2) ensuring the recognition and protection of their rights, systems and knowledge, especially in terms of natural resource management". This is one of the few available GEF project documents which refers to the rights of indigenous peoples. The project documents state that activities relating to indigenous peoples will build upon "the successful experiences catalyzed by WWF in implementing a collaborative management agreement on control of hunting with the Association of Baka pygmies of Minvoul (Northwestern of the Minkebe Forest Block), which aims at strengthening the legal and social status of the Baka and promoting benefit sharing from their ecological knowledge." It is now clear, however, that WWF's success at involving Baka Pygmies in their work has been grossly exaggerated – in most cases Pygmies are not involved in project activities, this has resulted in increased threats to their livelihoods²¹.

²⁰ pages 8 and 15 of the Project Brief

²¹ Personal communication, John Nelson, March 2005.

Box: The bushmeat debate:

Many past GEF projects, as well as those reviewed here, carry significant anti-poaching components. Some of its past projects have solely targeted the bushmeat trade and its related legislation (Gabon: Conservation of Biodiversity through Effective Management of Wildlife Trade, 1994). This responds to a global move, started in the early 90's, among conservationists and conservation organisations to address the bushmeat "crisis". The control of illegal hunting constitutes an important component of many of the GEF's activities in Central Africa. The GEF's approach is three-fold: (1) protection, (2) law-enforcement, such as the establishment of "enforcement squads" in the Douala-Odzala-Minkébé Transboundary park and (3) alternative livelihoods in order to lure people away from their allegedly 'unsustainable' activities.

Research such as that undertaken by the Overseas Development Institute's Bushmeat Programme (www.odi-bushmeat.org) now clearly shows that the ubiquitous "alternative livelihoods" approach is problematic, and that a change in perspective is required. Bushmeat hunting is a livelihood strategy for forest dependent peoples and other communities in Central Africa, as elsewhere, which in the case of indigenous peoples is closely linked to the very fabric of their culture, through reciprocity, gifts and trade. Pygmies have relied on bushmeat for their survival for millennia, and in many communities in Central Africa, it represents 100% of their animal protein intake. Proposing alternative livelihood options simply do not make sense in their case, and it is arguably in contravention of their right to food and to culture. David Brown²² of ODI argues that the bushmeat "problem" should be viewed through the lens of development rather than conservation. Brown contends that bushmeat hunting is a fundamental mainstay for communities, has many characteristics making it an attractive form of development, and should be supported as a component of social safety nets, if any control mechanisms are to work. He also holds that the stigmatisation of bushmeat hunting and trade in the west may in fact contribute to frustrating international conservation objectives rather than furthering them.

Brown maintains that the issue should be tackled at the level of governance of the forestry sector. Indeed by focussing on bushmeat as a development issue, it could represent an important component of governance reform, through legal and regulatory reform in a pro-poor direction, which must be linked to the establishment of channels for legitimate trade.

Thus, the 'alternative livelihoods' and law enforcement approaches are seriously conceptually flawed, are detrimental to indigenous and local communities, and can in fact be counter-productive to their aim. It is important therefore that the international conservation community, led by the GEF, must seek more rights-based and people-centred ways to address the bushmeat trade.

²² See Brown, D (2003) *Bushmeat & poverty alleviation: implications for development policy*. ODI Wildlife Policy Briefing, ODI, UK and Brown, D (2003) *Is the best the enemy of the good? Livelihoods perspectives on bushmeat harvesting and trade – some issues and challenges*. Paper submitted to the CIFO-Bonn Conference on 'Rural Livelihoods, Forests and Biodiversity', May 2003.

3. Conclusions

The GEF has a significant biodiversity portfolio in Central Africa. In the past few years there has been a trend towards incorporating conservation initiatives with other, productive systems, in the landscape approach. This has the potential to cause problems for indigenous peoples and communities affected by conservation, if their land, territory and resource rights are not recognised and respected in practice within such large-scale approaches.

Although many of the project documents of the projects reviewed state that processes have been participatory, that communities have been consulted, and that project affected people will only receive positive outcomes, it is essential that these assertions are tested in the field. In fact, findings from the FPP GEF critical study²³ show that these assertions are often unfounded (eg. the TRIDOM project).

The project documents reviewed have also often, directly or indirectly, used language suggesting a persistent view of local communities being the cause of unsustainable biodiversity loss. As a result, most projects reviewed have promoted the adoption of “alternative livelihood” approaches to reduce “pressure on the environment” exerted by communities who rely on natural resources. The GEF appears to have not progressed from the out-dated “the people are the problem” stance in many cases, and this is a fundamentally flawed basis upon which to construct successful and rights-based conservation projects.

Recent reviews of GEF projects and approaches, such as the Forest Peoples Programme’s critical study and the GEF’s own review of Local Benefits in biodiversity projects have shown that the GEF must update and review its approach to conservation as soon as possible. FPP’s critical guide and review also recommends that the GEF draft, in a fully participatory manner, and adopt an indigenous peoples’ policy, in line with the rights and needs of indigenous peoples, in order to ensure that its projects and programmes fully benefit its supposed “beneficiaries”. The GEF’s Local Benefits study has yet to be published, but initial findings suggest that the GEF requires a major change in approach if local people are to derive more genuinely sustainable benefits from its operations.

²³ See footnote 1

Annex 1 Summary of social data from project documents

Country	Project	Impl. Agen.	Rights (no. mentions – rel. to IPs)	SGPs (no. ment)	IPs (numb. Ment.)	Trad. Knowl (no. ment.)	Reloc.	Restrict. resource use	IPDP	Baseline Studies (social aspects)	Prop. BudgetIP /soc. issues	Community/local participation	OP	Categ.
DRC	Support to Rehabilit of PAs	IBRD	0	0	0	0	Yes – in context of spec. PAs	yes	no	no	NO budget	Not specifically noted. Mentioned 2-3 times.	OP 3	Full size
	Rehabilitation of PAs	UNDP	2 (in rel to conflict bt local/state claims)	0	0	0	No	Not directly	N/A	no	Comm. Based apprch: 0.5% ²⁴	Has a short specific section, but only includes communities as a stakeholder	OP 3	Full size
Rwanda	Int mgt of ecosys	IBRD	0	0	0	0	No	yes	no	1 mention	No budget	Mentioned 4 times, no dedicated chapter	OP 12	Full size
	Restoration of Cons. Capacity (concept note)		0	0	0	0	No	unclear	N/A	No	No budget	yes	OP 1,2,3, 4	Full size
Uganda	PA mgt and sust use	IBRD	0	3 (then says no OP applies in this case)	4	0	yes	yes	no	no	No budget	Mentioned 4 times, no dedicated chapter	OP3	Full size
	Bwindi Mgahinga forest (closed)	IBRD	0	4	Mention throughout & specific section	0	Yes + resettle plan	yes	yes	yes	No budget	~16 mentions and dedicated section on “community & Ngo participation”	OP4	Full size
Cameroon	Bamenda	UNDP	7	0	0	1 – promotion pf TK	No	unclear	N/A	no	No detailed budget	One of the main objectives, and has a special section dedicated to the topic	OP4 & OP 3	Medium size proj
	Biod cons and mgmt (closed)	IBRD	5	0	4	0	no	YES	no	yes	Comm. Dvpt: 3%	Mentioned throughout but no dedicated section on this	OP 3	Full size
	FESAC	IBRD	- quite good coverage - “traditional, customary and modern rights”	Detailed SGP section	Specific section on Pygmies	0	Not ruled out.	yes	no	no	No detailed budget	Mentioned throughout: superficially, project is set to be highly participatory	OP1	Full size
Gabon	Mgt of wildlife trade (closed)	UNDP	0	0	0	0	no	unclear	N/A	no	unclear	Not mentioned once!!	OP 3	Full size

²⁴ 13.5% of the budget goes to participatory activities, but 13% within that is directed through WWF and WCS for the restoration and maintenance of their pilot projects

The Global Environment Facility in Central Africa

	PSFE (currently being revised)	IBRD	0	0	0	0	No	yes	no	no	N/A	Mentioned largely in the context of national level workshops and 'full stakeholder participation', not specific to communities/local level	OP3	Full size
Congo	Wildlife prot & mgt (closed)	IBRD	3 (context- 'traditional usufruct rights')	1	2	1	Not ruled out	yes	no	1	None	Mentioned throughout and special section as well.	OP3	Full size
CAR	Bangassou dense forest - 1.6 M hectares of land → "conservation area"	UNOPS	Mention of land rights	0	0	0	no	Yes – aims for 'regulation' of resource use at local level	N/A	no	unclear	To be implemented in participatory manner – local participation = "fundamental"	OP 3	Full size
Regional	TRIDOM	UNDP/ UNOPS	taking into account use rights/access rights for LCs+ noting UNDP's policy of engagement & rights, systems & knowledge of IPs promoted, recognised and protected	0	Pygmies= stakeholders. "to be consltd & invlvd in landsc. plan. process"	1 x "promotion of knowl. of IPs"	No	YES	N/A	No + no social impact assessment.	No detailed budget	Section dedicated to "stakeholder participation" – within which, IPs have special para: "strengthening legal and social status of IPs and devpr benefit sharing mechanisms for their ecological knowledge"	OP3	Full size

Annex 2: summary of current GEF biodiversity projects in Central Africa

Country	Project title	Budget & GEF expenditure	Date	Lead Agency	Aims and Objectives
Cameroon	Community Based Conservation in the Bamenda Highlands	Total: US\$ 3.091 M GEF: US\$ 1M	1999 (5 yrs)	UNDP	The rationale of this project is based on the “inability of communities to sustainably manage resources”, and therefore aims to include a capacity building component to teach communities about the values of the forest. It also aims to revitalise the forestry sector through “sustainable management and exploitation” of natural resources.
	Promoting Community-based Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity in Priority Forest Sites within Cameroon Mountain Range	Total: US\$ 12.176 GEF: US\$ 4.166M Cofinancing: US\$ 8.010M	N/A	UNDP & UNOPS	The goal of the project is to conserve the Cameroon Mountain Range ecosystem and biodiversity “for the benefit of the local population as well as the global community” through a strengthened management of protected area system.
	FESAC	Total: US\$ 126.53M GEF: US\$ 10M Other Donors (DFID, CIDA, EC, etc): Govt: US\$ 27M	2004 (5 yrs)	World Bank	“The operation’s development objective is to strengthen public and private efforts to achieve socio-economically and ecologically sustainable use of national forest and wildlife resources. Within this objective, the operation seeks to: (1) promote the sustainable management of rainforests and savanna lands; (2) increase local community involvement in and benefits from sustainable management of natural resources; (3) improve the institutional and organizational capacity to implement new policies and regulations for forest management and timber industry development; and (4) enhance conservation of biodiversity and supply environmental services of national and global relevance.”
Central African Republic	A highly decentralised approach to the protection and utilisation of biological diversity in the Bangassou dense forest	Total: GEF: USD 2.5 M USAID: USD 150K WWF: USD 120K Government: USD 65K	1997 - stalled?	UNOPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - make policies, legislation and practices conducive to sustainable development of renewable resources in the Bangassou dense forest; - strengthen local institutions and partnership in order to create opportunities for developing natural resources and improving ecosystems management - promote specific economic activities that will help to raise income levels, provide opportunities for gainful employment, improve living conditions for communities of natural resources users and scientific information in order to build capacity in grassroots communities for sustainable management of natural resources
DR Congo	Rehabilitation of Protected Areas in the DRC	Total \$ 19.96 M GEF \$6.32 M IA: \$ 7.16M UNHCR: \$0.5 M EU Kivu&Virungas: \$1.8M EU ECOFAC: \$1.2M GTZ K-B:\$1.2M Govt: \$1.78M	1997 – restart 2004	UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - creation of a supportive policy, legislative, institutional, financial, institutional and social environment for PAs - restructuring of the Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature and the decentralisation of protected area management - restoration of essential functioning to all protected areas through the supply of essential human, material and financial resources - definition of approaches to participatory and community-based management of protected areas in the Congo on the basis of analysis of experience at pilot sites
	Support to the Rehabilitation of the Protected Areas System in DRC, in the framework of the National Forest and Biodiversity Sector Programme	Total: US\$ 47 M (for 1 st 5 yrs) GEF: US\$ 10 M IDA: US\$ 10 M EU+EC: US\$ 9 M USAID/CARPE/CBFP: US\$ 10 M Germany: US\$ 5 M INGOs: US\$ 3	2004	World Bank	The objective of this project is to “rehabilitate long-term institutional capacity to manage and monitor DRC’s national network of protected areas” through the support of the Biodiversity Sub Programme of the National Forest and Biodiversity Sector Programme (PNFC). The two components of the project are: (a) to support institutional rehabilitation and (b) to support selected sites.

The Global Environment Facility in Central Africa

Gabon	Programme Sectoriel Environnement et Forêts	Total: US\$ 63 M	2004	World Bank	No information at this time, since the project is being revised
Rwanda	Integrated Management of Critical Ecosystems	Total (14 yrs): US\$ 141M Ph. 1 total (4 yrs): US\$ 50.5M GEF: US\$ 5 M IDA: US\$ 45 M Govt: US\$ 0.5M	2001	IBRD	This project will finance the development of a regulatory framework for sustainable management of natural resources. It focuses on capacity-building, institutional strengthening and the development and implementation of “community-based integrated ecosystem management plans”.
	Restoration of Conservation Capacity for the Biodiversity Values of the Protected Areas	Total: US\$ 14.8M GEF: US\$ 8M Co-financing: US\$ 6.8M	2004 (not yet appr.)	UNDP	“The project will be designed to: (i) Examine and revise policies, strategies, institutional responsibilities, and action plans for the national system and its individual PAs, (ii) Provide critical support to restore and revitalize existing, war-damaged PAs, (iii) Strengthen PA management capacity and financial sustainability, (iv) Build constituencies for conservation at local and national levels, and (v) Develop coordinating mechanisms with local, national and regional partners in order to address pressures threatening the PAs and to build constituencies for their conservation
Uganda	Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use (PAMSU)	Total: US\$ 38M GEF: US\$ 8M IDA: US\$ 27M Govt: US\$ 3M	2002	IBRD	The overarching objective of this project is to achieve the “sustainable and cost-effective management of Uganda’s wildlife and cultural resources”. Some of its major focuses are tourism and public awareness/education. The project will also finance the reform of the Uganda Wildlife Authority.
Regional	Development of a Regional Strategic Action Programme for Environment & Biodiversity Resources of the Ecosystems of the Congo Basin	GEF: US\$ 0.347M	2000	UNDP	“The project will enhance regional efforts to conserve and sustainable use the Biodiversity of the forest ecosystems of the Congo basin by addressing priority common, shared, and transboundary issues.” The Strategic Action Program (SAP) was completed and formally adopted by the CEFDAC (Conférence sur les Ecosystèmes de Forêts Denses et Humides d’Afrique Centrale) in October 2000.
	Tridom Project (Conservation of Transboundary biodiversity in Minkébé-Odzala-Dja interzone in Gabon, Congo & Cameroon)	Total: US\$ 45.1M GEF: US\$ 10.5M Other Donors (ITTO, WWF, WCS, CI, EU): US\$ 23.4M Govts: US\$ 11.2M	2004 (7 yrs)	UNDP & UNOPS	The project’s objective is to “maintain the ecological functions and connectivity of TRIDOM, and ensure long-term conservation of its protected area system through integrated, sustainable and participatory management in the interzone between the protected areas”.
	Regional Environmental Information Management Project	Total: US\$ 15.319M GEF: US\$ 4.353M Other Donors: US\$ 8.232M	1997 (5 yrs)	World Bank	“The main goal of the project is to improve the planning and management of natural resources in the Congo Basin, with a specific focus on biodiversity conservation, by providing the various stakeholders with appropriate information on the environment in response to the information needs they have identified and will identify.”
	Trans-Boundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Lower Kagera River Basin (Rwanda, Uganda, Tanzania)	Total: US\$ 12 M GEF: US\$ 6 M Confinancing: - cash: US\$ 2M - kind: US\$ 4M	2003 (PDF B) 2005-09 (full project)	UNEP & FAO	“The overall goal of the proposed project is to protect the integrity of the ecosystems of the lower Kagera Basin, and to harness global environmental benefits through ensuring the productive and sustainable use of the biodiversity resources and agricultural ecosystems”