



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

GEF ID:	5060		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	Developing core Capacity for MEA Implementation in Cameroon		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-2; CD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$946,000
Co-financing:	\$1,167,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,113,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Monika MacDevette

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Cameroon ratified the CBD on October 19, 1994, the UNFCCC on the same date and the UNCCD on May 29, 1997. Cleared 8/20/2012	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. As per letter dated 7/25/2012. Cleared 8/20/2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNEP has comparative advantage to implement this project. Cleared 8/20/2012	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	To some extent. However, there should be a description of the number of UNEP staff involved in the project and their	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>competencies. Additional information is requested. 8/20/2012 No sufficient information provided. Please provide requested information related to country/agency who actually will be involved in implementation of this project. 10/05/2012</p> <p>Explanation provided. Cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	Resources are available within cross-cutting capacity development portfolio. Cleared 8/20/2012	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>There are a couple of issues here. First of all, the project is aiming at every single CCCD objective (1 to 5), which seems over-ambitious. We'd prefer to see the project concentrating on 1 or 2 objectives and really achieving what it's set out to do. Secondly, the CD1 objective should not have any funding allocated from the GEF. As per the CCCD strategy, this objective should be fulfilled through the GEF Country Support Program (CSP) and the National Dialogue Initiative activities,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>i.e. GEF Constituency workshops, Country Dialogue, etc. Therefore, this is not eligible as a separate fundable objective. Needs to be revised, the GEF funding reallocated or eliminated from that objective. Please provide revision. 8/20/2012</p> <p>Revision provided is not sufficient. It seems not feasible to have so many objectives implemented. It would be advisable not to include more than two objectives ensuring that capacities will be developed properly and in a sustainable way. Please make expected outcomes tangible and clear according to need identified in the NCSA and by the country. Revisions are requested. 10/04/2012</p> <p>The project framework has been revised and is better aligned with the CCCD Strategy. Cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>To some extent. However, more details on the specific links to the GEF Focal Areas are requested. Please provide additional information. 8/20/2012 Some information is provided. However, it is not clear what tangible results will be achieved in the expected outputs. Please identify. Please note that development of networks, community interests groups and etc. should not be financed by the GEF since they have very little to do with implementation of conventions. It is also not clear what kind of fiscal and tax policies will be developed/needed. Please make all</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>outputs focused on tangible results. Revisions are requested. 10/05/2012</p> <p>Tangible outcomes included. Outreach and engagement with regional and local stakeholders for information retrieval and environmental monitoring will be financed with other non-GEF sources. Cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with Cameroon's National Capacity Self Assessment completed in October, 2007 as well as other national priorities. Cleared 8/20/2012</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>No. There's no mention of how the project's results will be sustained in the longer term. Please provide additional information. 8/20/2012</p> <p>Information provided is not sufficient. Please make substantial revisions. 10/5/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>To some extent, although data that supports the baseline (i.e. investments that the GEF increment will complement) should be provided. Please revise. 8/20/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 10/5/2012</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>To some degree, yes. However, it is not clear how local activities planned under decentralized management approach can generate GEB? Additional information is requested. 10/5/2012</p> <p>Incrementality is better explained with co-financing focusing on regional and local level engagement and GEF financing national level institutional coordination and improving existing information management at that level. Cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>To some extent. However, as mentioned before, the project seems somewhat ambitious. There are too many components in the project for the amount of money allocated. Perhaps project components 1 and 4 could be merged. Please provide revision. 8/16/2012</p> <p>Revisions provided, however, tangible results to be achieved should be identified. Please use CD indicators. Additional changes are requested. 10/5/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 08/20/2012	
	16. 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	Yes. Cleared 8/20/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes they are. Cleared 8/20/2012	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 8/20/2012	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project seems to be consistent with several on-going initiatives in the country. Cleared 8/20/2012	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	It's not clear what the execution arrangements will be. Please provide this information. 8/20/2012 Some provided. However, please provide information how visibility of GEF investments will be ensured. 10/5/2012 Provided. Cleared 02/20/2013	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 8/20/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	As mentioned above, there seems to be too many objectives for the money that it's budgeted. It's recommended that the project be revised to decrease the number of objectives. Please revise. 8/20/2012 Provided revisions are not sufficient. Co-financing level in cash have to be at least 1:1. Please revise. 10/5/2012 Explanation provided. Cleared 02/20/2013	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing ratio in terms of in-kind co-financing seems fine, but please see number 24 above. 8/20/2012 It is not clear how Government of Cameroon is able to provide 462K in kind and only 200K in cash if it is their priority for reforms and implementing international conventions. Additional revisions are requested. 10/05/2012 Explanation provided. Cleared 02/20/2013	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	It seems low (around 2%). Please revise. 8/20/2012 Not sufficient. Cash co-financing has to be provided. Additional revisions are requested. 10/5/2012 Explanation provided. Cleared 02/20/2013	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. However, if the responses are adequate, it could be cleared. 8/20/2012 Additional revisions are requested 10/5/2012</p> <p>Not yet. Please reduce the agency fee to a maximum of 9.5% as per the new policy. Once this is revised, it could be cleared 02/20/2013</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please make sure to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Specific targets and indicators will be developed during the PPG phase. 2) Specific policies to be targeted and measurable indicators under the proposed financial mechanisms are to be identified during the PPG phase. 3) The Government has committed to identifying additional cash co-financing during the preparation phase. 4) UNEP will make further efforts to identify additional co-financing. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 20, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 20, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes appropriate. However, capacity baseline should be assessed using GEF CD indicators and provided with the project document. Please revise PPG document. 10/5/2012
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. Cleared 8/20/2012
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet. PIF needs to be revised. 8/20/2012 Not yet. PIF needs to be revised to reflect the new fee cap. In addition, according to the new policy, a maximum of \$50,000 can be requested for preparation for projects up to \$1 million. Please review and resubmit. 02/20/2013
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 20, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 20, 2013

* 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.