



## 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 (Resubmission)		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$7,956,880
Co-financing:	\$115,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$123,256,880
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
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
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	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.

<sup>1</sup> 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
		<p>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).</p> <p>DS, August 22, 2015: Comments cleared.</p>	
	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.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> 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	<p>AfDB 21.08.2015 PIF has been revised accordingly, see Table B, sections in page 14 to 17.</p> <p>AfDB, April 28, 2016: Cofinancing amounts have been revised to exclude loans for other Cities and roads/ICT. However, as discussed during our conf call, the final co-financing</p>

<sup>2</sup> 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>MO, April 25, 2016: PIF has been revised to better integrate CCM and CW objectives in order to create synergies and multiple benefits from less resources. However, due to reformulation of the PIF, the currently listed co-financing such as for roads and ICT development, as well as the loans for cities other than the targeted cities will not support the achievement of the objectives of the GEF project. Please refer to definition of co-financing (page 8 GEF/C.46/09).</p> <p>DS, April 28, 2016: Comments cleared.</p>	<p>amounts will be provided only during project preparation since the baseline project is still under discussion with the Country.</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)</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</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>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 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</p>	<p>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 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, point1.6</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</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>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 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>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 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> <p>AfDB, April 28, 2016:</p> <p>AfDB acknowledges that it is important to include, in addition to low carbon and low emissions, considerations for low chemicals strategies in urban development. Output 1.2.3 has been revised to include this aspect.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<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 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</p>	<p>This is linked to the above issue and AfDB agrees that it is important to consider the reduction of actual input (i.e. production of) of chemicals into urban areas for longer term solutions. The project will thus also consider the production side of waste.</p> <p>AfDB welcomes the comment; however, since effort has been made to revise table B to make the project more integrated between CCM and CW, we believe that adding an extra project component would result in loss of integration. Revisions have been made to the existing table and an output has been added (1.2.3), specifically on the design of material use policies that are aimed at preventing the production of avoidable waste and thus limiting its presence in the waste stream. In regards to GEF Secretariat Comments 1 and 2, there will be a strong consideration for reducing waste at its source during project development, and activities will not be limited to end-of-pipe solutions. This is now reflected in table B.</p> <p>AfDB acknowledges this comment. Output 2.1.3 has also been revised so that the activity is not limited to PBDE-containing plastics. The reviewers' comments are valid, and it is worth noting that in the text of the document (p. 8), it is acknowledged that the potential presence</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>emission of POPs and UPOPs only.</p> <p>DS/AS/MO, April 25, 2016:</p> <p>(1) On 1.2.3, it would be ideal if in the urban planning strategies, in addition to low carbon development, there would also be consideration of low chemicals and chlorine strategies for development; this way, the inputs of toxic/hazardous chemicals into urban development would be reduced;</p> <p>(2) On 1.2.4 to 1.3.4, please refer to (1) above; end of pipe solutions presented here may in the long term not sufficiently keep up if there is no consideration of inputs into urban areas;</p> <p>(3) It would be beneficial to include a component and outcome on material use policies that will prevent, in the long term, waste from being produced and will reduce the pressure on established waste management infrastructure also;</p> <p>(4) On PBDEs, it is noteworthy that primary usage was in CRT casings, meaning that once these are separated out of the waste stream, there is very little PBDEs left; the country</p>	<p>of PBDEs in plastics must be taken into consideration before processes to transform/valorize plastics are undertaken.</p> <p>Regulation and policy issues have all been moved under component 1.</p> <p>Outputs 1.2.2-1.2.6 have been more clearly phrased to distinguish between national and city-level policies and directives, to better respond to Council comments.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>therefore needs to establish acceptable concentrations of PDBEs should PBDE containing plastics be introduced into the recycling stream;</p> <p>(5) In regard to regulatory framework for renewable energy, as currently included in component 2, please consider moving regulation and policy issues to component 1, given that they are not concrete investments;</p> <p>(6) national and local-level environmental directives are still mixed: please distinguish clearly and elaborate on national vs. local level directives to ensure Council comments on previous PIF are incorporated accurately.</p> <p>DS, April 28, 2016: Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	DS/AS, August 6, 2015: Yes.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	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, April 25, 2016: Revised PIF has been resubmitted to incorporate STAP and Council comments. Based on these comments and through two informal consultations with GEF Secretariat Program Manager, the PIF has been restructured to enhance integration between CW and CCM focal area</p>	<p>AfDB 21.08.2015 All question have been addressed.</p> <p>AfDB, April 28, 2016: All new comments have been addressed.</p>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		<p>approaches. However, some issues remain; please address comments under Question 4 and 5 above.</p> <p>DS, April 28, 2016: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO PIF approval.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes 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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

<sup>3</sup> 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		