



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

GEF ID:	5367		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	PCB Reduction In Cameroon Through The Use Of Local Expertise And The Development Of National Capacities		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$56,000	Project Grant:	\$3,000,000
Co-financing:	\$12,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,356,000
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Evelyn Swain	Agency Contact Person:	Jorge OCAÑA CORREA

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.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, there is an endorsement letter.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagova Protocol Investment		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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>	Yes, this project is in line with Chem 1.	
	<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>	Yes, it is consistent with the NIP.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>It is not clear what the current baseline project is. What measures are currently going on in Cameroon to manage PCBs.</p> <p>ES, 8/15/13: The baseline project and the current situation in Cameroon have been clarified. Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>M&E is not included.</p> <p>On page 7 of the PIF UNEP mentions that the project includes a study on the reduction of carbon emissions through PCB management, this study is not included in the project framework (table B), and it is not clear if the GEF is financing this study through this project</p>	

		ES, 8/15/13: M&E has been added to component 4. UNEP has clarified that the study will compliment the project and will be paid out of co-financing, not GEF funding. Comment cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, this is clear. 1600 tons of PCB contaminated equipment and 200 tons PCB oil will be disposed of.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes.	
	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)	Climate risks are not addressed. ES, 8/15/13: Climate risks have been addressed. Comment cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. ● Assess whether the project is	The climate study is listed as the innovative component of this project, and it is not clear who is funding this study. Sustainability and scale up are addressed.	

	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	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 confirmed?	Co-financing is appropriate and significant co-financing comes from the private sector, the electrical facility.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No, PMC is too high. Agency fee is too high. ES, 8/15/13: PMC has been reduced to 5% and agency fee is 9.5%. Comment	

	19. <u>At PIE</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, PPG is requested.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this moment. Several issues listed above need to be addressed. ES, 8/15/13: All issues have been addressed. PIF clearance is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

	First review*	April 12, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 15, 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.