



Securing Permanent Forests to Combat Climate Change and Enhance Sustainable National and Local Economies in Cameroon

ANNEX 3B

Economic Feasibility Assessment

Version Date: 27/05/26

Introduction

The purpose of this economic and financial assessment (EFA) annex document is to:

- outline the approach and method adopted with respect to performing the financial analysis, quantifying the economic benefits and calculating the relevant financial and economic indicators;
- outline the limitations and primary assumptions of the analysis; and
- outline the data sources used in the analysis.

This EFA supporting report builds the investment case for GCF support by demonstrating the measurable value of ecosystem service improvements in the project target landscapes in Cameroon. The report is set out as follows:

- Section 1 describes the purpose of the EFA.
- Section 2 presents the EFA approach.
- Section 3 describes the detailed methodological approach employed in the modelling process and takes guidance from the GCF Guideline.
- Section 4 presents an analysis of the benefits of implementing the project.
- Section 5 provides the results of the EFA and the benefit-cost ratio of the project's intervention.
- Section 6 describes the method used to check the assessments results against the main parameters of the analysis, including main drivers of the costs and revenues, as well as the discount rate.
- Section 7 covers the motivation for grant finance.
- Section 8 details the conclusions arising from the EFA.

1. Economic and Financial Assessment Approach

This financial and economic assessment uses best available data and tested methodologies to estimate baseline and post-intervention financial and economic values (with and without GCF support), focusing on key sectors critical to household resilience and small farm holders, namely Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) collection (agroforestry), wood collection¹, groundwater recharge and also incorporating additional benefits such as carbon sequestration.

Several assumptions were made to simplify the economic and financial modelling process.

¹ Initially, the exclusion of harvesters from protected forests during intervention activities will reduce the collection of wood for the initial five years of the intervention. Thereafter, the value realisation occurs and a greater total volume of wood is available for harvesters.

Table 1 below describes the assumptions made, while Table 2 indicates a summary of the results. The results will be discussed in sections that will follow:

Table 1. Primary assumptions used in the EFA model

Main Model Assumptions	Unit	Value
Total hectares	ha	190,329
Social discount rate	%	6.00%
Project period	years	7
Discounting period	years	20
Financial discount rate	%	9.43%

Table 2. Summary of the Model Results

Model Results Summary	Unit	Value
Economic IRR	%	34%
NPV Cost	USD	32,546,330
NPV of net benefits	USD	152,575,082
NPV of Total Economic & Ecosystem Service Benefit	USD	189,411,010
Benefit to cost ratio		5.8
Cost per ha	USD/ha	245

The assessment is initiated with the valuation of baseline ecosystem services using data from reputable national and international sources (as far as possible). This includes existing values for NTFP collection, available area for wood collection and groundwater recharge across the systems in the intervention landscapes. These figures represent the baseline which is used for modelling the incremental value added by the GCF project.

To assess the impact of GCF financed interventions, an evidence-based ecosystem service approach is employed. This approach quantifies the improvement in ecosystem service delivery, such as improved groundwater recharge through improved ecosystems, increased wood supply from rehabilitated community forests following the implementation of project activities. These improved service values feed directly into the financial analysis model.

The financial analysis is conducted at the household or small farm holder level, with the understanding that households or farm owners in the targeted landscapes are the direct beneficiaries depending on a combination of ecosystem services to sustain part of their livelihoods. Importantly, the analysis captures the subsistence use and surplus collection which can be marketed or traded within the local community, providing a picture of the financial potential of ecosystem services, this includes collected NTFP products which could be traded within the community or consumed within the household. While some of the output in these systems is retained for household consumption within, the financial analysis estimates potential returns based on prevailing local and regional prices, for NTFP products which are usually sold for cash. This approach allows the model to reflect both the immediate, tangible benefits to

household food security and the broader financial opportunities available through increased productivity of the ecosystem services.

At the macroeconomic level, an integrated economic analysis is undertaken to assess the project's contribution to Cameroon's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This analysis is holistic, capturing not only direct outputs from NTFP collection and wood collection from community forests and private land but also groundwater recharge and carbon sequestration benefits from an improved ecological state. By comparing baseline conditions with projected post-intervention outcomes, the model clearly illustrates the financial, ecological (i.e. enhancement of ecosystem services) and economic returns that can be expected through GCF support.

2. Detailed Methodology

Below we present the model workflow.

2.1. Baseline ecosystem service valuation

The baseline valuation provides a monetary estimate of the key provisioning ecosystem services currently delivered by the systems in the three targeted landscapes. These services include food supply of the NTFP, groundwater recharge from enhanced ecosystem, carbon sequestration from the rehabilitated forests and wood collection from the community forests and private land. Establishing a robust baseline is essential to understanding the current state of ecosystem service flows and to quantifying the added value of GCF-financed interventions. The baseline scenario includes a degradation rate to reflect the continued decline in ecosystem condition over time under business-as-usual conditions. In the project scenario, this degradation rate is reduced to reflect the positive impact of restoration and sustainable land management activities. This approach captures both the avoided degradation and the improvement in ecosystem service delivery resulting from the project.

Agroforestry through NTFP harvested in a sustainable way to allow robust regrowth benefit household income. To estimate the production from the landscapes, the following was done:

- The production per household/harvester was obtained from the preceding iteration of the EFA documentation.
- The number of total collectors per NTFP was obtained from each landscape, in the preceding iteration of the EFA documentation.
- The prices of the selected NTFP's were obtained from the list of NTFP's to be promoted in each landscape under the project.
- These values were used to estimate the total revenue of agroforestry in the chosen landscape for each NTFP.

Access to water is a critical provisioning service. To estimate the value of groundwater recharge supply:

- The size of the intervention area was obtained from the EFA documents.

- Rainfall data was obtained from literature and climatological data sources.
- Evapotranspiration was adjusted in the project scenario to reflect the presence of additional tree cover. Trees generally use more water than crops or degraded land, meaning a higher portion of rainfall is consumed by vegetation and less is available for groundwater recharge. Due to limited data on water use for specific NTFP species, this was estimated using general vegetation-based assumptions.
- The percentage of groundwater recharge potential from rainfall was obtained from literature.
- These values were multiplied to obtain the volume of water and then multiplied by the raw water price.

In interpreting the groundwater recharge estimates, it is important to distinguish between the targeted direct intervention footprint and the broader landscape system within which hydrological benefits occur. The EFA adopts a landscape-scale ecosystem-service approach because the expected effect of restoration and avoided degradation is not limited only to the exact hectares directly planted or treated, but can influence hydrological function more broadly through improved vegetation cover, reduced land degradation and improved ecological condition in connected landscape units. For this reason, the model considers recharge effects at landscape scale, while the project itself targets a smaller priority intervention area within those landscapes.

At the same time, benefits are not assumed to arise fully and immediately. Hydrological and ecological improvements are expected to accrue progressively as restoration activities are implemented and as vegetation establishes over time. The phasing adopted in the model therefore reflects delayed and gradual benefit realisation rather than an immediate step change at project commencement.

The groundwater valuation should be interpreted as an indicative estimate of the economic significance of hydrological ecosystem services under improved landscape management. Given the complexity of these processes and the limitations of available local hydrological data, the estimates are best understood as order-of-magnitude values suitable for feasibility assessment.

Wood collection is a major source of energy throughout rural Africa, including the project areas. To calculate the wood collection ecosystem service:

- The size of area of community forests to be rehabilitated was obtained, also private land was included where possible.
- The wood production potential of savanna forest was obtained from literature.
- Wood prices were also obtained from literature.
- These values were used to calculate the total wood yield potential for each landscape.

2.2. Financial analysis

The financial analysis was developed to compare the current financial performance of landscapes agroforestry of the chosen NTFP with the projected improvements under different intervention conditions. It includes three core components: a baseline scenario representing current economic conditions, a with-project scenario incorporating improved ecosystem service delivery, and a with-project scenario with GCF support reflecting additional intervention benefits.

The baseline analysis captures the financial value generated at the household or small farm holder level from the NTFP collection, groundwater recharge potential and wood collection from community forests and private land, is based on the ecosystem service valuation.

Due to the high level of the subsistence nature of these systems, reliable data on annual input costs and capital expenditures is limited. In response to this data constraint, the model draws on credible, research-backed estimates of typical financial returns from systems in similar contexts. This literature data was used to determine financial returns for each chosen NTFP for the landscapes.

To estimate costs, the model takes the known value of production (i.e., revenue potential) and solves for the cost input required to achieve a margin of 25% obtained from literature (O. Ndoye, 1997). This allows for a consistent and evidence-based representation of the financial performance of the baseline for the NTFP.

In the with-project scenarios, the cash flow model integrates increased production values derived from the evidence-based ecosystem service intervention plan, including agroforestry expansion and broader landscape rehabilitation activities. These enhanced revenue projections for the selected NTFPs reflect expected gains from higher crop yields. Ecosystem service improvements are also quantified using literature-based values for groundwater recharge, carbon sequestration, and wood collection across community forests and private land. The second with-project scenario further incorporates the incremental benefits associated with GCF-supported activities.

Using the same cost assumptions as the baseline model, the with-project scenarios recalculate financial returns under improved agroforestry conditions, including the planting of 20,000 seedlings of the selected NTFP per landscape. The first scenario captures the benefits of project implementation alone, while the second reflects the additional incremental returns enabled by GCF support. Together, these scenarios provide a clear and quantitative basis for assessing the value added by the project from a household or smallholder perspective, demonstrating how enhanced ecosystem productivity translates into stronger and more resilient rural livelihoods.

2.3. Economic analysis

The economic analysis captures the broader, economy wide benefits of the project, including non-market ecosystem service gains.

The first component of the economic analysis involves estimating the additional GDP generated as a result of increased ecosystem service productivity. Specifically, increased NTFP yield from the additional seedlings planted in the intervention area. The production accrues between the third and the sixth year going forward depending on the number of seedlings planted in a single year. The yield increases for the seven consecutive years of which the seedlings were planted.

Value realisation percentages were applied in the model to reflect the gradual accrual of benefits over time, particularly for tree-based systems where productivity increases as trees mature. Value realisation indicates the proportion of total potential benefits achieved in a given year. For example, a value realisation of 40% in year 5 implies that 40% of the full long-term benefit potential is expected to be realised by that year. This approach allows the model to account for the delayed and progressive nature of ecosystem service and production benefits associated with agroforestry interventions.

All economic and ecosystem service benefits, market and non-market, were aggregated to estimate the total economic benefit of the project. Against this total, the full cost of the GCF-financed interventions was accounted for, allowing for the calculation of the project's net economic benefit.

3. Costs

The total cost to establish value chains for NTFP products in the target landscapes is estimated at a high level and amounts to approximately US\$9 million. Estimations of on-the-ground interventions from the GCF budget amount are approximately US\$4 million. The total cost for the GCF project is US\$46,045,635.

(See Annexure 4 for the budget).

The capital expenditure assumptions used in the EFA are planning-level estimates intended to test the economic feasibility of the proposed interventions. The CAPEX inputs were structured around the main intervention categories reflected in the model, namely:

- establishment costs for NTFP production systems, including land preparation, seedlings, fertiliser and tools;
- value-chain processing infrastructure for selected products;
- farm-support infrastructure such as warehousing and field equipment; and
- an initial working capital and contingency provision.

Area assumptions for the establishment of the priority NTFP systems were based on the intended scale of intervention by crop/value chain as represented in the model. These assumptions were used to derive reasonable establishment-cost estimates for

cashew, bitter kola, ndoo (wild mango) and raffia palm. The purpose of these area assumptions is to estimate the total scale of investment required to support phased value-chain development across the implementation period.

The lump-sum allowances used for processing and storage infrastructure reflect the expected minimum enabling infrastructure required to operationalise the priority value chains at landscape level. These include, where relevant, shelling, drying and grading equipment for cashew; storage, fermentation and bottling equipment for raffia/palm-wine processing; cracking, extraction and packaging equipment for bitter kola and ndoo; and cross-cutting support infrastructure such as warehouse space and field equipment. At EFA stage, these values should be understood as indicative investment estimates aligned to the proposed intervention logic and budget structure, to be refined during detailed technical design, procurement specification and implementation planning.

With respect to scale adequacy, the infrastructure assumptions were included to represent the minimum level of productive and post-harvest support required to avoid bottlenecks in aggregation, basic processing, handling and market preparation. The model therefore treats these costs as catalytic investments that enable value realisation rather than as stand-alone commercial processing facilities.

Operating costs associated with production activities are reflected in the financial modelling assumptions. To the extent that additional operations and maintenance costs arise for processing infrastructure, these should be refined during detailed design and implementation planning and, where material, incorporated into the relevant operating-cost lines.

4. Benefits

As mentioned in preceding sections, the economic benefits consider additions to GDP. The economic benefits generated by the project arise through several linked pathways. First, the project is expected to increase the productivity and value of selected NTFP value chains through the establishment of additional seedlings, improved ecosystem condition and better enabling infrastructure for aggregation, handling and basic processing. This creates additional production value at landscape level and improves opportunities for income generation for participating households and smallholders engaged in collection, cultivation, handling and trade.

Second, the project improves ecosystem service delivery beyond marketed production alone. The rehabilitation of forests, agroforestry systems and associated landscape functions contributes to improved wood supply potential, groundwater recharge and other non-market ecosystem services. These benefits are economically important even where they do not translate into direct cash income at household level in the short term, because they reduce pressure on natural systems, improve the availability of productive resources and support resilience in local livelihood systems.

Through this, the EFA captures wider economic effects through the inclusion of economic benefits across the value chain and ecosystem-service values. In this sense, the project's benefits should not be interpreted narrowly as farm-gate income, but rather as the combined value of additional production, avoided degradation, improved resource availability and broader economic activity enabled by healthier and more productive landscapes.

A useful interpretation of the results is therefore to consider both aggregate and intensity indicators. At aggregate level, the model estimates the NPV of additional GDP created from NTFP production, wood collection, groundwater recharge and other ecosystem services. At intensity level, the model also indicates the scale of investment per hectare of landscape supported. These indicators help illustrate that the project is not only economically justified in total, but also represents a meaningful investment in restoring the productive capacity of target landscapes.

From a livelihood perspective, the project's economic logic is based on strengthening and stabilising income opportunities linked to ecosystem-dependent production systems rather than generating high short-term private profits. Income gains are expected to arise through increased NTFP output, improved value realisation from supported value chains, and enhanced ecosystem productivity over time. The project therefore contributes to economic resilience by increasing the quantity, reliability and value of benefits that households and communities derive from the landscape.

Lastly, many of the benefits, particularly those associated with tree-based systems and ecosystem restoration, accrue progressively rather than immediately. The reported economic results therefore reflect the cumulative effect of restoration and value-chain support over the modelled period rather than a single-year change.

Table 3 shows the value of each respective economic benefit (discounted at 6% over a 20-year period). The total value (NPV) of the additional GDP created as a result of increased ecosystem services from GCF project interventions is US\$264 million over the 20-year modelled period.

Table 3. Economic and ecosystem service benefits

Indicator	Total/Combined
NPV of Additional GDP Created: NTFP crop production	65 801 380
NPV of Additional GDP Created: Wood collection	-1 018 782
NPV of Additional GDP Created: Groundwater recharge	20 469 295
NPV of carbon benefit	111 575 695
NPV of Total Economic and Ecosystem Service of Benefits	196 827 587

5. EFA Results

Table 4 presents a comprehensive comparison of baseline and project scenarios across the three target landscapes of Cameroon, along with aggregated totals. The analysis confirms that GCF support significantly enhances both the financial viability and economic impact of the project area for the beneficiaries.

The NTFP production increased to US\$7 million annually from the existing NTFP's and the additional 20,000 seedlings to be plated in each landscape. Groundwater recharge potential increases to US\$3.6 million annually for all project landscapes. Wood collection potential within community forests and private land shows a gain of \$107 467 per annum.

The NPV of total economic and ecosystem service benefits is calculated at over \$189 million, exceeding by a substantial margin, the NPV of the project costs of \$32 million over the seven year implementation period. This translates into a benefit-to-cost ratio of 5.8, meaning that for every \$1 invested by GCF, nearly \$6 is generated in the economy.

It is once again worth noting that much of the value generated accrues to households or small farmers through local consumption and through local value chains and trade, especially for the collected NTFP, which generates the cashflows needed to sustain part of the livelihoods for the collectors. These incomes are however, accrued to the households or small farm holders, and due to this, the use of grant funding in this project is promoted due to low capacity to sustain debt. The GCF-funded intervention will likely enable conditions that can foster the development of formalised markets, contributing to financial sustainability of the intervention in the future beyond the GCF funding cycle.

Table 4. EFA Results

Indicator	Total/Combined
Baseline Scenario (without GCF support)	
Revenue potential: NTFP crop production	1 000 000
Financial IRR	-1%
Project scenario (with GCF support)	
Revenue potential: NTFP crop production	7 000 000
Ecosystem service potential: Wood collection – Real terms	107 467
Ecosystem service potential: Groundwater recharge – Real terms	3 628 899
NPV of Total Economic and Ecosystem Service Benefit	189 411 010
NPV of Project Costs	32 546 330
Financial IRR	7%
ERR	34%
Benefit-to-cost Ratio	5.8

6. Sensitivity analysis

Given the assumptions made in the EFA modelling, it is prudent to assess a range of variables on the modelling outcomes. The sensitivity analysis tests both general economic parameters and project-specific risks that may influence the project's performance. The key variables that were assessed for variation are identified as:

- Cost increase by 20%
- Revenue decrease by 20%
- Cost increase by 20% and revenue decrease by 20%
- Change in NTFP production by 1%
- Change in social discount rate by between 3-4%
- Change in water yield by 1%
- 20% reduction in adoption rates
- 10% reduction in tree survival rates

The EFA model is structured to support sensitivity analysis by allowing the user to select a scenario and specify the percentage change applied to a given variable. The model is then recalculated and results are updated. One can then make a comparison of the original or most-likely results to the new results based on the changes specified. The parameters specified are as follows:

Scenario definition		
#	Scenario	amount (indicate +/-)
0	Most likely scenario	100%
1	Increase in NTFP production	Specify a percentage incr 1%
2	Increase in water yield	Specify a percentage incr 1%
3	Increase in social discount rate	Specify a percentage incr 10%
4	Decrease in NTFP production	Specify a percentage dec -1%
5	Decrease in water yield	Specify a percentage dec -1%
6	Decrease in social discount rate	Specify a percentage dec 3%
7	Cost increase	Specify a percentage incr 20%
8	Revenue decrease	Specify a percentage dec 20%
9	Cost increase by 20% and Revenue decrease by 20%	Specify a percentage incr 20%
10	Lower adoption rates	Specify a percentage dec -20%
11	Reduced survival of planting trees	Specify a percentage dec -10%

Figure 1. Sensitivity analysis parameters

The above variables were tested independently and their respective impacts on NPVs and rates of returns were calculated.

The outcomes of the sensitivity analysis are outlined in Figure 2 below:

Scenario	Scenario Results													
	Unit	Most likely scenario	Most likely scenario	Increase in NTFP production	Decrease in NTFP production	Increase in social discount rate	Decrease in social discount rate	Increase in water yield	Decrease in water yield	Cost increase by 20%	Revenue decrease by 20%	Cost increase by 20% and Revenue decrease by 20%	Lower adoption rates	Reduced survival of planting trees
Indicator/Value change														
Revenue potential (after project interventions)	\$	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	7 000 000	6 000 000	6 000 000	6 000 000	6 000 000
Financial return: IRR with GCF support	%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	-3%	5%		5%
NPV of net cashflows with GCF support	\$	-1 542 538	-1 542 538	-1 539 193	-1 545 883	-1 542 538	-1 542 538	-1 542 538	-1 542 538	-1 542 538	-6 179 833	-3 080 720	-11 427 851	-3 079 880
NPV of economic and eco-system services	\$	189 411 010	189 411 010	189 431 229	189 390 790	119 160 118	276 792 714	189 865 285	189 301 105	189 411 010	177 820 070	177 820 070	173 964 382	183 615 540
Economic rate of return: ERR with GCF support	%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	34%	32%	32%	33%
% Change From Most Likely Scenario														
Indicator														
Financial related benefits (after project interventions)				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%				
NPV of net cashflows with GCF support				-0.22%	0.22%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%				
NPV of economic and eco-system service benefits				0.01%	0%	-37.09%	46.13%	0.24%	-0.1%					
Economic rate of return: ERR with GCF support				0.02%	0%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	0.0%					

Figure 2. Sensitivity analysis results (see Sensitivity Analysis tab in Annex 3 model)

The sensitivity analysis demonstrates how variations in key assumptions influence the project results. For example, a 1% increase or decrease in NTFP production results in a 0.5% change in revenue potential. The results confirm that, even under less favourable assumptions, the project remains economically viable and resilient to changes in key drivers.

7. Motivation for Grant Finance

7.1. Supporting Factors

Although the proposed project supports climate-smart agroforestry interventions and livelihood practices, with the potential for increased income and profit generation accrual at the community level, several factors justify the request for 100% grant finance. These factors are listed below.

- Cameroon's substantial interdimensional poverty and structural impediments to sustainable development significantly limit local communities' upfront investment capacity in climate-smart solutions. Despite the potential for long-term economic benefits, the initial financial barrier and the time required to realise returns on investment pose significant challenges for communities already living at the margin. This suggests that proposed project interventions are unlikely to result in surplus income for beneficiaries. Instead, introduced income generating activities will focus on enhancing local GDP, food production, wood collection and water access, thereby providing communal economic benefits rather than individual financial benefits.
- National priorities generally focus on immediate development needs; therefore, limited budgetary leeway reduces scope for investing in long term climate resilience initiatives, without external support.
- As described above, the proposed project operates in areas with minimal private sector presence for establishing and/or enhancing formalised value chains within the communities, further compounded by limited potential for immediate cost-recovery and revenue generation due to the nature of the interventions. This scenario limits the attraction of private investment in the short to medium term, necessitating grant support to initiate and demonstrate the viability of such interventions.

- Grant financing from the GCF is sought not only as a funding mechanism, but as a catalyst for systemic change. By providing grant finance, the GCF will enable the implementation of foundational EbA measures that lay the groundwork for sustainable, climate-resilient development. The grant support will facilitate the establishment of necessary infrastructure, capacity building and institutional frameworks, setting the stage for future investments and scaling.
- The successful implementation of the project with GCF grant finance will serve as a demonstration of the viability and effectiveness of EbA measures, potentially attracting future investments from both public and private sectors. By proving the concept and showcasing tangible benefits, the project will create a replicable model for climate resilience that can be scaled both within Cameroon and in other similar contexts. This highlights the scalability of the project in terms of replicability, with low potential for scaling at original project sites due to the spatial arrangements of the landscape.

7.2. General analysis

The project interventions are designed to enhance community resilience and sustainable development in the face of climate change, focusing on long-term benefits rather than immediate financial gain. Given the communal nature of the benefits, such as increased resilience to climate impacts, improved ecosystem services and stronger institutional capacities, the financial returns are mainly social and environmental, not entirely monetarily direct or individual.

On the basis of this financial analysis, grant financing from the GCF is justified for this project, since the activities:

- require significant upfront investment without direct financial return or a secure revenue base;
- deliver communal and environmental benefits that are crucial for long-term resilience and sustainability; and
- support adaptive capacity and livelihood security improvements that are not quantifiable in immediate financial terms.

This analysis demonstrates that grant finance is the most appropriate instrument for the proposed project, considering the communal benefits, the low-revenue-generating nature of the activities and the critical need for adaptation and resilience-building in Cameroon.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, the EFA strongly supports the viability and impact of the proposed project interventions in Cameroon. The cost-benefit analysis reveals that, even under conservative scenarios, the project delivers a positive return on investment with benefit-to-cost ratio of 7.72. These findings underscore the effectiveness of ecosystem-based adaptation in strengthening household and community resilience to

climate change through improved ecosystem services. Notably, even in the least favourable sensitivity scenario, the interventions remain cost-effective, which provides confidence in the robustness of the proposed measures.

Despite the promising returns, the analysis clearly demonstrates the need for grant financing. Given the communal nature of the benefits, the absence of immediate surplus income for direct beneficiaries, and the high upfront costs of foundational infrastructure and capacity building activities, the project is not suitable for loan-based or cost-recovery financing. The project is aimed at lifting communities above subsistence thresholds, not generating high profits at an expense of environmental degradation. As such, GCF funding serves as a catalyst for transformative change, enabling systemic shifts in climate resilience, institutional capacity, and long-term development. To ensure successful implementation will depend on continued technical support, strong governance structures, and active community participation to realize the full potential of the interventions.

9. References

1. Adipo, S.O. (1995) Production characteristics of *Garcinia kola*. Available at: <http://archives.gjasr.com/index.php/GJASR/rt/prINTERfriendly/39/143>
2. African Cashew Alliance (2025) Africa Cashew Market Report – Week 15. Available at: https://www.africancashewalliance.com/sites/default/files/splits/africashewsplits_week_15_market_report_2025_aca.pdf
3. AgriFocus Africa (2024) The state regulates the use of irrigation water in the face of shortages. Available at: <https://agrifocusafrica.com/2024/03/04/the-state-regulates-the-use-of-irrigation-water-in-the-face-of-shortages/>
4. Ako, A.A., Eyong, G.E.T. and Shimada, J. (2011) *Relationship between climate and groundwater recharge in the Besseke watershed, Douala-Cameroon*. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, 63(5), pp. 1001–1008. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267252714>
5. Climate Investment Funds (CIF) (n.d.) Forest Investment Program: Cameroon Investment Plan. Available at: https://www.cif.org/sites/cif_enc/files/fip_ip_cameroon.pdf
6. CoziLogs (n.d.) The ultimate guide to buying firewood in bulk. Available at: <https://www.cozilogs.co.uk/the-ultimate-guide-to-buying-firewood-in-bulk/>
7. CIFOR (2016) Forest and landscape restoration in Central Africa. Available at: https://www.cifor-icraf.org/publications/pdf_files/articles/AEbaa-Atyi1602.pdf
8. Department of Water and Sanitation (2025) Raw water use charges. Available at: <https://www.dws.gov.za/Projects/WARMS/Revenue/Gazette%20notice%20for%20raw%20water%20use%20charges%202025.26.pdf>
9. Environmental Journal of Environmental Science and Management (2023) Volume 16(4). Available at: <https://ejesm.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/ejesm.v16i4.4-1.pdf>

10. FAO (n.d.) Crop evapotranspiration (FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 56). Available at: <https://www.fao.org/4/X5043E/x5043E06.htm>
11. Favreau, G., Cappelaere, B., Massuel, S., Leblanc, M., Boucher, M. and Boulain, N. (2009) Modelling groundwater recharge, actual evaporation and transpiration in semi-arid sites of the Lake Chad basin: the role of soil and vegetation in groundwater recharge. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374686240>
12. Illinois University (n.d.) Water pricing example. Available at: <https://publish.illinois.edu/cee449watersanitationenergy/category/kenya/>
13. IUCN (2025) Feasibility Study Report: Cameroon Central Africa (VF Annex 2A).
14. Ndoye, O. and Ruiz Pérez, M. (1997) The markets of non-timber forest products in the humid forest zone of Cameroon. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/240319763>
15. Ndi, R.A., Akoachere, R.A. and Eyong, J.T. (2024) Quantifying the non-revenue water problem in a sub-Saharan African environment: A practical application in Cameroon. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382078141>
16. Njukeng, J.N., Ndzié, J.P. and Fontem, D.A. (2022) Dieback of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale*) in Cameroon. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363073917>
17. Palmpedia (n.d.) *Raphia hookeri*. Available at: https://www.palmpedia.net/wiki/Raphia_hookeri
18. Plants for a Future (PFAF) (n.d.) *Raphia hookeri*. Available at: <https://pfaf.org/user/Plant.aspx?LatinName=Raphia+hookeri>
19. PROTA (n.d.) *Irvingia gabonensis*. Available at: <https://prota.prota4u.org/protav8.asp?h=M4&t=Irvingia,gabonensis&p=Irvingia+gabonensis>
20. Satoyama Initiative (n.d.) Farmland management strategies by smallholder farmers in the Mount Bamboutos landscape. Available at: https://satoyamainitiative.org/case_studies/farmland-management-strategies-by-smallholder-farmers-in-the-mount-bamboutos-landscape-in-cameroon-sitr8-5/
21. Tchatchou, B., Sonwa, D.J. and Ifo, S.A. (2016) Economic estimation of carbon storage and sequestration as ecosystem services of protected areas: A case study of Lobeke National Park. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308888677>
22. Viriar (n.d.) *Raphia regalis* (King raffia palm). Available at: <https://www.viriar.com/blogs/palms-tree-encyklopedia/raphia-regalis-king-raffia-palm>
23. Zhang, L., Dawes, W.R. and Walker, G.R. (2001) 'Response of mean annual evapotranspiration to vegetation changes at catchment scale', *Journal of Hydrology*, 270, pp. 1–17.