



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5263		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Resilience of Poor Communities to Urban Flooding in Yaounde		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,032,000
Co-financing:	\$145,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$149,032,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	HORUGAVYE, PATRICE

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	YES. Cameroon is a non-Annex I country party to the UNFCCC and is eligible under the SCCF.	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated January 16, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

	or Technology Transfer)?	fee) is available under the SCCF Technology Transfer Program (SCCF-B).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed SCCF project is closely aligned with Cameroon's Growth and Employment Strategy (GESP), as well as the first National Communication to the UNFCCC (2005). The project is also consistent with Cameroon's National Plan for Climate change, initiated in August 2012.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please reference any relevant information pertaining to water, sanitation or urban planning/development, as shown in strategies/plans listed. For example, the GESP document (2010-2020) identifies "Urban Development and Housing" and "Water and Sanitation" as growth areas, in line with the SCCF project (See: http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/scr/2010/cr10257.pdf). For each growth area, the document lists several implementation strategies, such as "maintaining and rehabilitating urban infrastructure", and "improving access to basic urban services". This level of detail would be recommended at CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	6. Is (are) the baseline	NOT CLEAR. The proposed SCCF project is associated	

<p>Project Design</p>	<p>problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>drainage systems, and describes 2 phases of baseline activities to which the project will build. However, the PIF lacks sufficient detail on current progress towards baseline project objectives (i), (ii) and (iii) (pg.4) - more specifically, in regard to phase 1 activities (which began in 2005). It is also not clear how financing for the 2 phases (\$130.5 million) (pg.4) relate to project components in Table B, and co-financing amounts in Table C, which calculate to \$120 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (1) progress made towards achieving baseline project objectives, and (2) how baseline investments described relate to project components (Table B) and indicative co-financing (Table C).</p> <p>04/11/2013 – YES. The re-submission adequately describes activities completed during phase 1 (pg.5), and how baseline project outputs relate to the proposed SCCF components and co-financing, as requested.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please describe each of the 10 baseline project components (outputs) listed on pg.5. Also describe the baseline scenario related to Cameroon's institutional capacity for urban planning and management, as they relate to component 1.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project framework (Table B) lacks an objective. An objective should be included.</p> <p>Please refer also to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (1) revise the project framework accordingly, and (2) include an objective.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. Recommendations in sections 6 and 8 have been addressed. Indicative co-financing figures have been revised accordingly, and a project objective has been included in the project framework.</p>	

	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The additional cost reasoning could be further strengthened.</p> <p>Please refer to section 6.</p> <p>Additionally, for component 1, the PIF cites that "climate change risk are integrated into policies, regulations and urban planning" (Table B), but, in the component description (pg.6) does not provide examples of the existing policies or regulations to which risks will be integrated.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6 above, please (1) strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. And, (2) provide examples to policies and regulations to which climate change risks will be integrated, and (3) clarify how locations or communities will be selected under components 2 and 3.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The project identifies relevant strategies and plans into which adaptation will be integrated (pg. 6). The PIF also clarifies that the project would target vulnerable communities in informal settlements adjacent to the baseline investments, based on public consultations.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a clear methodology to how component activities (as shown on pgs. 6 -7) will be implemented.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including</p>	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	

	<p>peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>By CEO Endorsement, please clarify how public participation will be ensured during both project preparation and implementation.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF identifies solid waste disposal, and water and sanitation problems to be major risks, and proposes various mitigation measures. However, the document could also consider operational risks such as project delays or poor co-ordination with stakeholders that could equally hamper progress towards objectives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include operational risks that could also prevent the achievement of project objectives.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. Operational risks have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF notes that there are several bilateral and multilateral donors involved in the water and sanitation sector (pg. 9), but does not describe these relevant initiatives. Furthermore, the document should also indicate any initiatives related to the community-based adaptation measures proposed under component 3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please list the other relevant initiatives with which coordination will be sought.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. The proposed project includes a number of innovative aspects, and relevant pathways for scaling up, but these cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, sustainability and scaling up, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The proposed project introduces policy reforms, information products and services, as well as proven technologies to enhance the resilience of vulnerable urban communities in the face of climate change -induced hazards, particularly floods.</p>	

	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>The project would be fully integrated into considerable baseline investments in urban water and sanitation services, and it would contribute directly towards integrating climate change adaptation into relevant city-level development policies and plans. As a result, the proposed project is well placed to generate sustainable adaptation benefits with considerable potential for scaling up.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please see section 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the grant and co-financing figures per component, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The indicative co-financing amounts in tables A, B and C, have been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. In line with its role, AfDB would bring \$120 million to the project. However, there is a slight mismatch in figures: co-financing is indicated as \$120 million in Table C, but as \$130.5 million in section A of PIF (pg.4).</p> <p>Please see section 6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6, please revisit the co-financing figures. as appropriate.</p>	

		04/11/2013 -- YES. The indicative co-financing figures have been revised as recommended.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$190,000, or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-4, the proposed SCCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG of \$125,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		

	Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17. 04/11/2013 “ YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 5,6 and 8.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 02, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**