



**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT  
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT  
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT GEF, VISIT [THEGEF.ORG](http://THEGEF.ORG)**

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project Title: Disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides and strengthening sound pesticide management in Cameroon			
Country(ies):	Cameroon	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	4641
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	613309
Other Executing Partner(s):	MIANDER, MINEPDED (Government of Cameroon)	Submission Date:	July 16, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	171,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

**A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>**

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
CHEM-1: Phase out POPs and reduce POPs releases	Outcome 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner	Output 1.4.1 Strategies for the disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides, and for the remediation of contaminated sites developed and implemented.	GEFTF	1,710,000	9,307,374
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>1,710,000</b>	<b>9,307,374</b>

**B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

<b>Project Objective:</b> To reduce POPs releases from obsolete pesticide stockpiles and contaminated sites and strengthen the capacity for the sound management of pesticides.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
<b>Component 1:</b> Safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides, and remediation of contaminated	TA	<u>Outcome 1:</u> Existing POPs and obsolete pesticide stocks disposed of in an environmentally sound manner and POPs pesticide contaminated sites remediated.	1.1 Strategy for disposal of up to 100 metric tons of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes developed. 1.2 Disposal of approximately 100 tons of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes completed.	GEFTF	691,000	2,486,055

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

sites		<p>Main indicators:</p> <p>a. Up to 100 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides disposed of by the end of year 2.</p> <p>b. Risk reduced at 2 highest risk sites by 50% by the end of the project.</p>	1.3 High-priority contaminated sites remediation pilots developed and implemented for at least two high risk sites.			
<b>Component 2:</b> Management of empty pesticide containers	TA	<p><u>Outcome 2:</u> Risks to the environment and human health from empty pesticide containers reduced through establishing and enhancing container management systems at national level.</p> <p>Main indicators:</p> <p>a) 35% of the containers entering the market for use are triple rinsed at the end of their life.</p> <p>b) 25% of the containers entering the market are recycled.</p> <p>c) Reduced number of incidents of pesticide poisoning reported to health and hospital centres in pilot zones(baseline to be established)</p>	<p>2.1 Pilot container management schemes designed for two regions of Cameroon by project year 2 (collection, rinsing, transport, storage and recycling).</p> <p>2.2 Pilot schemes operational in North and South-West regions by project year 3.</p> <p>2.3 National empty pesticide container management strategy based on the pilot schemes approved/endorsed by project year 4.</p>	GEFTF	200,000	1,000,000
<b>Component 3:</b> Strengthening institutional and regulatory framework for pesticide management	TA	<p><u>Outcome 3:</u> Regulatory framework and institutional capacity strengthened for sound management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle</p> <p>Main indicators:</p> <p>a) Approved legislative texts and regulations cover full pesticide life cycle and are in compliance with the Code</p> <p>b) Number of pesticide inspections and quality control analyses conducted (30% increase in the number of inspections – baseline to be determined)</p> <p>c) Information exchanged by compliance and enforcement institutions- formal mechanism in operation by project year3.</p>	<p>3.1 Pesticide management legislation and registration system revised and improved in conformity with the Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management (draft legislation submitted for approval by Parliament by end of year 3).</p> <p>3.2 National Phytosanitary Council operational by end of project year 1 and coordinates pesticide life cycle management and control</p> <p>3.3 Increase national capacity for pesticide inspections and post-registration control (40 mandated and sworn in pesticide inspector;).</p> <p>3.4 Information accessible and exchanged on pesticide registration, imports and health impacts</p> <p>3.5 14 national laboratory technical staff trained and sustainable operational plan developed</p> <p>3.6 National capacity increased to implement registration in line with the Code ( 15 members of national registration committee trained; and 1 student completing post-graduate diploma course)</p>	GEFTF	221,028	4,445,000
<b>Component 4:</b> Promotion of alternatives to	TA	<p><u>Outcome 4:</u> Alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted and the</p>	4.1 At least 10 potential alternative products and/or practices for cotton pest control in the Sudano-Sahelian region of	GEFTF	319,500	835,000

conventional pesticides and communication strategy		use of chemical pesticides, POPs and highly hazardous pesticides (HHP) reduced. Main indicators: a) 50% reduction in HHP registrations from baseline and 5 biopesticides registered b) Number of alternatives used by network farmers (e.g. IPM) . Target to be established through typology study. c) 30% decrease in annual quantity of chemical and HHP used in project demonstration areas	Cameroon identified 4.2 Identified alternatives to POPs and other hazardous pesticides tested for their technical and economic feasibility at farm level. 4.3 Viable alternatives to POPs and other hazardous pesticides are promoted through training of extension agents, farm advisers and farmers.			
<b>Component 5:</b> Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	TA	<u>Outcome 5.1:</u> Project monitored and evaluated effectively (and results inform project execution decisions)	5.1 Project monitoring system providing monthly and six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project outputs and outcomes. 5.2 Midterm and final evaluations conducted and reports submitted to GEF Evaluation Office 5.3 Project “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” disseminated via publications, project website and others.	GEFTF	112,000	120,000
Subtotal					1,543,528	8,886,055
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>					166,472	421,319
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>1,710,000</b>	<b>9,307,374</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER)	In-kind	4,311,212
Government	Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED)	In-kind	480,000
Non-government organization	University of Ngaoundere	In-kind	1,325,000
Non-governmental organization	Association des Femmes Africaines Intègres pour la Recherche et le Développement (AFAIRD)	In-kind	300,000
Non-governmental organization	The Research and Education Centre for Development (CREPD)	In-kind	1,000,000
Private Sector	CropLife	Grant	1,011,843
Private Sector	CropLife	In-kind	709,319
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	170,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>9,307,374</b>

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL, AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	POPs	Cameroon	1,710,000	171,000	1,881,000
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>1,710,000</b>	<b>171,000</b>	<b>1,881,000</b>

1 In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

2 Indicate fees related to this project

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants	172,000	614,000	786,000
International consultants	318,000	1,100,010	1,418,010

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?**

**No**

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

**1. Component 1:** In the PIF it was estimated that the amount of obsolete pesticide stocks that needed disposal was 300 tonnes. This was based on an inventory of obsolete pesticide stores and contaminated site conducted in 2009. Data collected and entered into the Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) indicated substantial amounts of pesticides (over 280 tonnes) stored in over 97 locations in 10 Provinces. This data was used as the basis for the development of the PIF for the project. A review of this data completed as part of the PPG process highlighted that significant quantities of this material were usable and in many cases had been sold. The situation was confirmed as part of a CropLife International (CLI) safeguarding exercise which was completed in 2012. The exercise confirmed that all stockpiles from the largest stores identified in PSMS were now used. Over 3 missions, the CLI team achieved the safeguarding of approximately 45 metric tonnes of obsolete pesticides to a central storage location at Edea. Consultations with CLI representatives and national personnel involved in the inventory process have confirmed that the amount of obsolete pesticides stored at Edea is likely to constitute about half of the total amount of stocks which will need to be removed from the country. The remaining stocks are understood to remain in private hands and as with all projects of this type will only be released once a public outreach campaign confirms that the stocks will be removed and sent for disposal. It is therefore estimated that the total amount of obsolete pesticides and heavily contaminated materials requiring environmentally sound disposal under this project is 100 metric tonnes, in contrast to the 300 metric tonnes identified in the PIF.

A review of the PSMS data collected in five of Cameroon's 10 regions in 2009 has identified 6 high-risk locations where there are significant amounts of soils contaminated with pesticides. In addition to these sites, a number of others have been identified including during Croplife safeguarding activities. Additional sites are likely to exist where producers have buried unknown quantities of stocks in the past. The amount of contaminated soil is far higher than originally anticipated in the PIF and it is now proposed that the project focus efforts on quantifying the amounts of material for treatment and developing plans for risk reduction via on-site remediation of the sites.

The budget allocated to component 1 has been modified taking into account these changes.

- 2. Component 2:** Outputs have been refined. In addition, an element of sustainability has been incorporated in the design with a national empty pesticide container management strategy. The strategy will ensure commitment by the Government of Cameroon to roll out container management nationally, based on the results of piloted schemes.
- 3. Component 3:** Project monitoring and evaluation has been separated out of component 3, and is now under a new component 5.

Minor changes have also been made in the allocation of the GEF grant across the components.

#### **A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Updates Reports, etc.:**

Since the PIF was submitted in 2011, Cameroon completed its NIP in December 2012. The NIP objective is to reduce by 2028, the sources of POPs in Cameroon in order to protect human health and the environment against the effects of those substances. The project will contribute to the implementation of the NIP through each of its components, but particularly by dealing with POPs sources (obsolete stocks, contaminated sites, and empty pesticide containers) under Components 1 and 2. By focusing on an improved legislative framework and the

---

<sup>4</sup> For question A.1-A,7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question

piloting and dissemination of alternatives, Components 3 and 4 will help to ensure that activities undertaken in Components 1 and 2 are sustainable.

**A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:**

The project contributes to the implementation of the GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy. It focuses on: CHEM-1, specifically the management, prevention and disposal of POPs wastes and sound environmental management of contaminated sites. The project will dispose of about 100 tonnes of existing obsolete pesticides and remediate heavily contaminated priority sites. To prevent future mismanagement, focus will also be on strengthening institutional capacity to enforce pesticide regulations.

**A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:**

N/A

**A.4 The baseline project and the problem it seeks to address:**

The description of pesticides management issues in Cameroon and past and ongoing initiatives undertaken to address these have been strengthened based on data collected during the PPG. Please see section 1.2 in the FAO project document.

**A.5 Incremental / Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:**

Please see section 1.2c in the project document. The incremental reasoning has also been improved based on the PPG analyses.

**A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

Description of risk	Ranking	Mitigation measures	Responsibility
Institutional arrangements pose challenges related to execution of the project	Low	The project was prepared in a participatory manner by the relevant ministerial departments. However, Cameroon has some history of difficulty in inter-ministerial collaboration. The project execution activities have therefore been carefully allocated between Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED) and Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER) and a fully functioning and active PSC will be necessary to guide the project.	Project Steering Committee (PSC)
Potential for political instability	Low	There is currently no apparent sign of political unrest.	MINEPDED, MINADER
Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers.	Medium	Management measures to be included in the EMP include field procedures to ensure no further leakage occurs during the project activities. Chemical stores will be ranked according to leakage risk at the beginning of the project, and will be safe-guarded as a matter of priority.	MINEPDED

Insufficient national ownership of revised pesticide legislative framework.	Low	National stakeholders were consulted during the PPG and other preparatory activities. Continued sensitization will be conducted during project execution including national training sessions with key staff.	PSC
Monitoring staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers.	Low to medium	Training in safety, monitoring and handling procedures will be provided to all national monitoring staff. Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) provided for all personnel involved in safeguarding.	MINEPDED, FAO
Insufficient funds for safeguarding of major contaminated sites, the disposal of POPs and other project activities	Medium	The PPG has carefully reviewed all obsolete stock and contaminated sites data, and revised the inventory estimates. The project will respond to any changes to the existing inventory to ensure that: priority sites are repackaged; pesticides disposed of; and contaminated sites remediated.	PSC, FAO
Insufficient national capacity in undertaking evaluation and decontamination of pesticide contaminated sites	Medium	Capable institution(s) will be contracted to carry out decontamination operations working together with a national team in order to impart expertise on <i>in situ</i> soil remediation.	FAO, PSC
Climate risks such as floods, crop calendars disruption or increase of pest invasions	Medium	Emergency sites will be primarily safeguarded during the driest months with a view to reducing risks associated with torrential rainfall. Contingency plans, especially targeting removal of excess water accumulated in the holding areas, as well as an assessment of flood risk, will be included in the EMP and implemented in the event of torrential rains.	MINEPDED, FAO
Low existing use and uptake of alternative technologies by producers.	Low	A large-scale information and awareness-raising campaign about the modes of application and effectiveness of the proposed alternatives will be undertaken to help promote uptake of alternatives. The promotion of IPM through FFS has been quite successful in previous related initiatives and, together with assistance from local NGOs, will be employed as part of this project to raise awareness on alternatives.	MINADER
Poisonings among the agents involved in the collection and re-grouping of un-rinsed empty pesticide containers.	Medium	Training modules revolving on technologies for the safe collection and re-grouping of these wastes will be specifically designed for the pilot project agents, and all agents trained prior to the piloting of collection activities.	MINEPDED
Pesticide companies/ distributors and farmers do not support the project.	Low	The project has involved and will continue to involve the private sector and producers associations in all the processes related to the project implementation.	PSC

Customs noncompliance in the implementation of the pesticides control system at entry points.	Low	Awareness-raising/ Obtaining the formal commitment of the Ministry of Finance (Customs). Customs' involvement into the development of the new control system.	PSC, MINADER lead
---	-----	---	-------------------

## A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The project will also be closely coordinated with three similar GEF-financed initiatives in Benin, Cameroon and CILSS mainly through the FAO Lead Technical Unit (the Pesticide Risk Reduction Group in the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) which will be providing technical oversight and guidance to all these projects.

## B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

### B.1. Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:

Stakeholders and their specific role in the project are described in section 1.4 and section 4.2 in the FAO project document.

To allow for the involvement of other key ministries in the management of the project, a Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established to support the project by monitoring the quality and timeliness of the execution of project activities and delivery of outputs, and propose adjustments as necessary. The PSC is a multi-stakeholder forum comprising representatives from not only line Ministries but also representatives from Crop Life International, national NGOs and other interested and affected parties as defined during the project inception phase. The PSC will normally meet on an annual basis, with extraordinary meetings called by the Chair as necessary, and be chaired by the Minister of Environment or his representative.

The project will work with a number of partners (e.g. Institute for Agricultural Research and Development (IRAD Croplife Cameroon, the Cameroon Development Corporation, and the Research and Education Centre for Development) who will contribute to the execution of specific components/outputs through MoUs or Letters of Agreement. The partners will be part of component teams set-up to enhance engagement of key stakeholders, to access a variety of skills needed to implement the components, and to capitalize on networks and channels of communication already established.

The project will work with the Association of Honest African Women for Research and Development (AFAIRD), who will collaborate with the project to ensure that women's needs and roles are addressed by the project, particularly in targeting the awareness raising on container management to women, who engage in and are affected by the practice, and in supporting the inclusion of women farmers in the alternatives profiling research.

### B. 2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project is expected to generate community health benefits through decreased exposure to highly hazardous pesticides, by: removing sources of these chemicals from stockpiles and contaminated sites; removing contaminated containers from communities; promoting and encouraging availability and uptake of non-toxic alternatives; and enhancing the quality of products through better control of pesticides in their life cycle, ultimately reducing pesticide residues. By promoting alternatives to chemical pesticides, the project will help producers reduce their reliance on credit and expensive inputs, contributing to increased profits from production<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Documented evidence from the West African Regional Integrated Production and Pest Management Programme (Settle and Hama Garba, FAO 2009 [www.fao.org/templates/agphome/documents/IPM/WA\\_IPPM\\_2011.pdf](http://www.fao.org/templates/agphome/documents/IPM/WA_IPPM_2011.pdf)).



Due to the traditional roles and responsibilities of women, they are more vulnerable to the adverse effects of pesticides than men. Women constitute the bulk of the labor force in fruit and vegetable agricultural holding and processing units and are exposed to high pesticide residues in handling produce. Women may also produce food for family consumption but use pesticides intended for other crops, not in accordance with the intended uses and conditions, exposing themselves and their families to high levels of inappropriate residues. Taking into account the comments of the Scientific and Technical Assessment Panel (STAP), the project will identify the specific differences in the roles of women and men in the crop cycle in Cameroon, and the related pesticide uses. As highlighted by the STAP, once these needs are understood they can be effectively integrated into alternatives training under Component 4. In addition, the project will ensure that: women are represented in project component activities, thus increasing opportunities for professional women in the agriculture sector; and specifically target women through partnerships with civil society organizations (e.g. Association of Honest African Women for Research and Development) in training and awareness-raising activities, to ensure women are aware of the risks posed by pesticides, and empty pesticide containers, which are used to harvest fruit and vegetables and for domestic purposes, often by women.

### **B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

The project will focus on local, low-cost, low-technology soil decontamination activities for contaminated sites, therefore avoiding the need for export of contaminated soils. The disposal element will benefit from FAO's unique experience in disposing of obsolete pesticides around the world. This experience has demonstrated that the use of specialist companies to export and destroy the pesticides at dedicated hazardous waste treatment facilities is the most cost-effective environmentally sound management strategy.

For Component 2, the project will implement pilot projects on management of empty pesticide containers in North and South-West Cameroon. Once the pilot schemes are operation the systems will be operated, by trained national teams. To ensure cost-effectiveness the scheme will be operated in collaboration with the pesticide supply industry as an extension of existing activities implemented by CropLife Cameroon. Components 2 and 4 both have pilot activities in the North zone, and the project will maximise coordination of resources including farmer networks under Component 4, or the awareness campaign for Component 2.

## **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN**

### **Oversight and reviews**

Project oversight will be carried out by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and FAO. Project oversight will be facilitated by: (i) documenting project transactions and results through traceability of related documents throughout the implementation of the project; (ii) ensuring that the project is implemented within the planned activities applying established standards and guidelines; (iii) continuous identification and monitoring of project risks and risk mitigation strategies; and (iv) ensuring project outputs are produced in accordance with the project results framework. At any time during project execution, under performing components may be required to undergo additional assessments, implementation changes to improve performance or be halted until remedies have been identified and implemented.

### **Monitoring responsibilities**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and results indicators established in the project results framework and the annual work plans and budgets. M&E activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The M&E plan, which has been budgeted at USD 112,000 will be reviewed and updated during the project inception phase. This will involve: (i) review of the project's results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and action to be taken to collect the information; and (iv) clarification of M&E roles and responsibilities of project stakeholders. The project's M&E system will be put in place within the first 6 months of project implementation.

The day-to-day monitoring of the project implementation will be the responsibility of the Project Management Team led by a Technical Project Coordinator and driven by the preparation and implementation of annual work plans and budgets (AWP/B) and six-monthly project progress reports (PPRs). The preparation of the AWP/B and six-monthly PPRs will represent the product of a unified planning process between main project partners. As tools for results-based-management (RBM), the AWP/B will identify actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output targets to be achieved, and the PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the achievement of output targets. An annual project progress review and planning meeting should be organized by the Project Management Team with the participation of representatives from key executing partners prior to the Project Steering Committee Meeting. The AWP/B and PPRs will be submitted to the PSC for approval (AWP/B) and Review (PPRs) and to FAO for approval. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the project's Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfillment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

### Indicators and information sources

To monitor project outputs and outcomes including contributions to global environmental benefits specific indicators have been developed in the Results Framework (see Appendix 1 in the project document). The framework's indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO's monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats, data collected will be of sufficient detail to be able to track specific outputs and outcomes and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis if possible or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

Monitoring information sources will be evidence of outputs (reports, website, farmer surveys, lists of participants in training activities, manuals etc.). To assess and confirm the congruence of outcomes with project objectives, physical inspection and/or surveying of activity sites and participants will be carried out. This latter task would often be undertaken by the Project Management Team supported by the FAO LTO and LTU.

Please see section 4.6.4 in the project document for the description of M&E reports that will be produced.

### Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	National Project Coordinator (NPC), National Technical Coordinator (NTC) Project Steering Committee, FAO (FAO Cameroon as Budget Holder - BH, FAO Lead Technical Officer and Technical Unit- LTO and LTU, FAO GEF Coordination Unit)	Within first two months of project inception	USD 7,000
Inception report	National Technical Coordinator (NTC) with inputs from project partners. Cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, and the Project Steering Committee.	Immediately after the project inception workshop	USD 1,500
Design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation system, including staff training	NTC with support from FAO LTO and LTU.	Within the first six months after the project inception	USD 12,500

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Field-based impact monitoring	NTC with support from other project partners – local NGOs, farmers/producers associations.	Continually	USD 3,500
Supervision missions	FAO LTO/LTU.	Annual or as required.	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Project progress reports (PPRs)	NTC. Submitted to the BH and LTU for clearance. Finalized reports submitted to the FAO GEF Unit by the LTO, and to the PSC by the PC.	Six- monthly	USD 4,500
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO LTO with inputs from the NTC, BH and LTU. Submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat. Final report also submitted to the PSC and the GEF Operational Focal Point.	Annually	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Reports on co-financing	PC with information from all co-financing partners.	Six monthly and annually as part of PPR and PIR.	USD 500
PSC meetings	Project Coordinator, PSC Chair, FAO Budget Holder	At least once a year	USD 19,000
Technical reports	PC, Consultants, FAO LTO/LTU	As appropriate	Component budgets
Mid- term evaluation	External consultant, Organized by FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 31,000
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 31,000
Terminal report	NTC, FAO LTO	At least one month before end of project	USD 1,500
			USD 112,000

## PROVISION FOR EVALUATIONS

An independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken at project mid-term to evaluate progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving the project objectives, outcomes and outputs. Findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be instrumental for bringing improvement in the overall project design and execution strategy for the remaining period of the project's term. FAO will arrange for the MTE in consultation with the project partners. The evaluation will, *inter alia*:

- (i) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- (ii) analyze effectiveness of partnership arrangements;
- (iii) identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- (iv) propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary; and

(v) highlight technical achievements and lessons learned derived from project design, implementation and management.

An independent Final Evaluation (FE) will be carried out three months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners. The FE will aim to identify the project impacts and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. This evaluation will also have the purpose of indicating future actions needed to sustain project results and disseminate products and best-practices within the country and to neighbouring countries.

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mr. Justin Nantchou Ngoko	GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURE PROTECTION YAOUNDE CAMEROON	05/13/2011

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino, Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy		July 16, 2014	Kevin Helps	+3906 57052725	<a href="mailto:Kevin.Helps@fao.org">Kevin.Helps@fao.org</a>
Jeffrey Griffin Officer-in-Charge for daily matters FAO GEF Coordination Unit Investment Centre Division FAO				+3906 57055680	<a href="mailto:GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org">GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org</a>

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found):

Please see Appendix 1, pages 49-58 of the FAO project document.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

STAP Review – comments at PIF	Response
<p>a) The document recognises the role of women in agriculture, and the repurposing of pesticide containers for domestic uses. It also goes the extra mile in saying that men AND women will be targeted in Farmer Field School activities. The STAP also hopes that care will be taken to identify specific difference in the roles of men and women in the crop cycle, and related chemicals use. For example, men may administer the pesticides to crops, and be recipient of safety equipment, but women may do more weeding and gathering of crops after pesticide treatments have been carried out, increasing their exposure, and calling for specific guidance on how best to protect themselves, and any children that may accompany them in the fields. Noting that the STAP does NOT have a social scientist on board, and is certainly not an authority on gender roles in Cameroon, this latter comment is only offered to prompt thinking on possible gender role differentiation as relates to the various steps in the crop cycle, and hopes that extension training consider these things. Also, the dangers of informal, repurposed use of POPs containing containers should be included in any targeted awareness in communities; and there may be a large gender component to this (eg if women do water collection and other gathering of food etc using repurposed containers).</p>	<p>Under component 4 on alternatives, the project will adopt an innovative profiling of farming systems among representative networks of cotton farmers in the Soudano-Sahelian agro-ecological zone, and horticultural producers in the forest zone. The profiling will enable identification of pest control practices, viable alternatives and the respective roles of men and women in the prescription, purchase, storage, conditions of application of pesticides, containers management and disposal of remaining stocks throughout the cropping cycle. Best farming practices for reducing exposure to pesticides by men, women and children involved in or impacted by farming will be identified.</p> <p>The best practices will be fed back into communications strategy, which will include a component on container management particularly targeting women and other groups.</p> <p>The project will collaborate with the Association of Honest African Women for Research and Development (AFAIRD, Association des Femmes Africaines Intègres pour la Recherche et le Développement) to ensure participation of women and that women’s needs and roles are addressed by the project.</p>
<p>b) FAO certainly has ample experience and good track record inputting together IPM strategies, as well as the site remediation work, and the STAP hopes that FAO will wherever possible highlight in the project document how seasonality and climate vulnerability are taken into consideration. This would be of benefit for generation lessons learned for the POPs portfolio.</p>	<p>Climate variability will be taken into account in the development of disposal and remediation strategies as guided by the FAO Environmental Management Tool Kit for Obsolete Pesticides (EMTK) .</p> <p>The evidence-based approach to selection of suitable alternatives to highly hazardous pesticides ( which must be relevant to the climatic and ecological conditions of Cameroon) under component 4 will include consideration climate vulnerability and documentation of climate factors as far as possible.</p>
<p>c) Mention is made of upgrading a National laboratory. STAP suggests that this laboratory be used to identify polluted sites and to prioritize these for intervention as part of Component 1, and to monitor success of site remediation.</p>	<p>Upgrading of the national laboratory will be undertaken with co-finance from MINADER. GEF funds will be utilised to evaluate training needs of national laboratory technical staff, to address priority training needs, and to develop a business plan for the laboratory. Taking into account STAP’s comments, the project will confirm the analysis capability for contaminant analysis, and where possible,</p>

	<p>utilise the laboratory for analysis of samples collected from contaminated sites, pre- and post- remediation. Samples will also be analysed by the University of Ngaoundéré, as part of its co-finance commitment to the project. This will provide the opportunity for the national laboratory to act as the “check” laboratory, thereby confirming the accuracy of the analysis.</p>
--	---



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>6</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<b>PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD50,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent to date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
1. First multi-stakeholder consultation	5,000	5,000	0
2. Design of a draft strategy for the disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides stocks; and identification of priority contaminated sites	10,000	9,356	0
3. Preparation of a draft container management strategy	1,000	1,000	0
4. Identification of gaps in existing legislation and capacity building needs for sound pesticide management	14,000	14,000	0
5. Preparation of a strategy for the promotion of alternatives to POPs pesticides	14,000	13,000	0
6. Detailed design of project components based on incremental reasoning, risk analysis, financing plan and institutional and implementation arrangements	10,000	10,000	0
7. Final multi-stakeholder consultations	5,000	5,000	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>48,356</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>6</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent funds, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

**N/A**