



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9234		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Integrated Sustainable Urban Development (SUDP) and environmentally sound management of municipal solid waste project in Cameroon		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 3; CW-2 Program 3; CW-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$7,956,880
Co-financing:	\$168,840,000	Total Project Cost:	\$176,796,880
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Jose TOPNATO

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Partly. Project is aligned with CCM-2, Program 3, and CW Program 3. CW Program 2 is primarily geared towards the enabling activities of the Convention. The resources related to chemicals would thus best be sourced from CW Program 3 alone. In addition, although Table D lists biodiversity as a focal area of this project, the link to BD strategic	AfDB 21.08.2015 Table A revised to reflect CW2-program3 and CCM2- Program 3. For STAR allocation flexibility, we discussed and this has been clarified.

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		objectives seems unclear. Please clarify if the project is intended to use the flexibility under STAR to increase the project's allocation for climate change mitigation. If this is the case, please remove the reference to biodiversity from the PIF and adjust Table D and E accordingly; Table D would then reflect the same amount for climate change mitigation stated in Table A (\$1.73 million). DS, August 22, 2015: Comments cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	DS/AS/DER, August 6, 2015: Partly. This project proposes to integrate CCM and CW focal area objectives. This would be logical if the project activities in Component 1 focus on urban waste management, land-use planning for reduction of waste, and waste to energy projects. However, the project activities in	AfDB 21.08.2015 PIF has been revised accordingly, see Table B, sections in page 14 to 17.

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 1, especially 1.3 and 1.4 are regarding mobility solutions. We do not see any integration linkages in the project between waste reduction and mobility. Please consider refocusing CCM related activities on waste, waste to energy, and land-use planning as it relates to low-carbon urban development. Mobility activities should be eliminated or minimized.</p> <p>DS, August 22, 2015: Comments cleared. PIF has been revised to better integrate CCM and CW objectives in order to create synergies and multiple benefits from less resources.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Partly. Please address the following issues:</p> <p>(1) While greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions/avoidance from sustainable urban planning is identified, the project seems to also cause GHG reductions/avoidance from the establishment of controlled landfills (Component 2). Please clarify whether this is in fact envisaged and quantify the estimated GHG emission reductions/avoidance arising from this aspect of the project, in addition to the already quantified</p>	<p>AfDB 21.08.2015</p> <p>This GHG emission reduction from controlled landfills has been quantified, see page 19 and 20. In addition to the 2.5million tons CO2 reduction, a total of 20g-TEQ/year releases of UPOPS will be reduced through controlled landfills and alternatives solution to open burning of municipal solid waste, healthcare waste and eWaste. However, a paragraph has been added to reflect clearly this GHG reductions from establishment of controlled landfills.</p> <p>A section has been added to reflect how</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GHG emission reductions/avoidance.</p> <p>(2) A number of countries have already piloted and demonstrated interventions to reduce UPOPs emanating from waste and poor waste management practices. Please elaborate how these are taken into consideration and what practical interventions aimed at addressing the barriers that prevent the sound management of waste are proposed that also prevent emissions of UPOPs.</p> <p>(3) Please elaborate on the sustainability of financing the municipal waste management system beyond GEF support and project completion. What is the proposed financing plan for upgrading the system in the medium- to long-term?</p> <p>(4) A number of countries have already piloted and demonstrated practical opportunities for dealing with mercury and UPOPs from health care waste. Please elaborate how the proposed project takes these into consideration to remove the barriers to appropriate health care waste treatment in Cameroon.</p> <p>(5) Please elaborate in how far the project would build on and draw from</p>	<p>project includes lessons learnt from other GEF interventions and countries to reduce UPOPs from waste, see page 18.</p> <p>A section has been added for sustainability beyond the project timeline, see page 20, point 1.6</p> <p>See answer provided above for question 5.2 and Revised PIF page 18</p> <p>The project will implement a used batteries management plan by the establishment of a collection center and a plant for the smelting of lead from used batteries. It will also set up a reward system for recovery of used batteries. This will allow the recovery of not dismantling the used batteries to avoid being contaminated by lead and to avoid melt lead will issue UPOPs.</p> <p>The component e-waste of the project will cover a well-defined process: preparation of a detailed inventory to compile a complete inventory of the cities involved in Cameroon; designing a system recovery obligation to ensure that a significant percentage of electrical and electronic waste stream join the organized waste; creating a manual dismantling center, where first recycling will take place, in compliance with environmental and health standards. This center will be</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>co-financing to improve secondary lead smelting on top of which GEF resources would facilitate the prevention of UPOPs' emissions, given that GEF funding is sought for dealing with used lead acid batteries.</p> <p>(6) Please elaborate on the scope of the e-waste component, in particular relating to SAICM and the overall improvement of e-waste management including connecting e-waste recycling to commodity supply chains, vis-à-vis, the sound management and/or prevention of the residual fraction that contains or can emit POPs and UPOPs.</p> <p>DS, August 22, 2015:</p> <p>(1) Comment cleared;</p> <p>(2) Comment cleared for PIF stage; at CEO Endorsement stage, please provide an inventory of relevant initiatives in other African countries with which this project will coordinate and learn from;</p> <p>(3) Comment cleared for PIF stage; at CEO Endorsement stage, please</p>	<p>in relation to downstream partners at national and international level to ensure the desired treatment of the recovered fractions. Wherever possible, these fractions will be processed in national centers. However, the dangerous parts can be exported to Europe or Asia for a final treatment in a foundry. All this will prevent or reduce emissions UPOPs or pollution from new POPs (PBDEs and PFOS).</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>elaborate whether a fee-based system would help ensure long-term financial sustainability beyond project completion and describe how the Ministry of Environment and the cities' municipalities can integrate long-term financing for the project's outcomes into their planning and budgeting;</p> <p>(4) Comment cleared for PIF stage; at CEO Endorsement stage, please provide an inventory of relevant initiatives in other African countries with which this project will coordinate and learn from;</p> <p>(5) and (6) Comments cleared for PIF stage; at CEO Endorsement stage, please provide more detail on the exact use of GEF funding vis-a-vis other funding and elaborate how eligibility criteria for GEF funding are met, in particular considering that GEF funding should target the emission of POPs and UPOPs only.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	DS/AS, August 6, 2015:	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Not yet. Please address comments under Questions 1, 4 and 5. In addition, please:</p> <p>(1) change focal area specification in Table D from 'multi-focal areas' to 'chemicals and waste', as the former is reserved for SFM; (2) align the amounts requested for PPG in Table E with the amounts requested for focal areas in Table D, to reflect the appropriate proportions between focal areas; (3) specify co-financing amounts and the type of co-financing for each source of co-financing listed in Table C.</p> <p>DS, August 22, 2015: Comments cleared for PIF stage. At CEO Endorsement stage, please consider remaining comments under Question 5. The Program Manager</p>	<p>AfDB 21.08.2015 All question have been addressed.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		