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:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$3,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$13,267,100**	Total Project Cost:	**$16,267,100**
PIF Approval:	**September 12, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**November 07, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Evelyn Swain**	Agency Contact Person:	**Kevin Helps**

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.	Yes.
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes, there is an endorsement letter.	Yes.
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	Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Yes, this project is in line with Chem 1.	Yes.
	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?	Yes, it is consistent with the NIP.	Yes.
Project Design	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?	It is not clear what the current baseline project is. What measures are currently going on in Cameroon to manage PCBs. ES, 8/15/13:The baseline project and the current situation in Cameroon have been clarified. Comment cleared	The section on baseline only reports what was presented in the NIP from 2013, over two years ago. During PPG stage there should have been further development of the baseline, including inputs from the government and utility sector. The baseline information on collection and disposal technology is also missing. ES, 9/4/15: Some baseline information has now been gathered during the PPG stage. -Comment cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	M&E is not included. 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. 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	It is not clear from table B or the description of the project components exactly what the management plan is for PCBs which are not shipped to Europe for disposal. The Figuel Cement Kiln is mentioned as an option. However there was no work done during to the PPG stage to determine if this facility has the necessary safeguards in place including health and safety standards consistent with international practice. It would also be useful to know if there are air emission laws and if this facility can comply with them. The project document also suggests that if Figuel is not adequate there will be alternative financing raised to retrofit this facility. How will this funding be secured? How will this impact the timing of this project? Where is the Figuel Cement Kiln located and how was it chosen and what will be criteria for choosing an alternative facility? ES, 9/4/15: Some additional information about the Figuel Cement Kiln was projected, however it is still not clear that this is a feasible technology. The project not plans to do a feasibility study to determine if this is an appropriate technology. This should have been done during the PPG stage and at the time of CEO endorsement the technology should be known. Based on the information provided the Figuel facility does not have the necessary safeguards in place and it is not clear if the facility will be able to make the necessary

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			changes to be in compliance with international standards on destruction efficiency. According to the GEF policy "Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards" in a project such as this the Agency should conduct an Environmental Impact Assessments of proposed projects or technology to help ensure environmental soundness and sustainability. Has the agency conducted such an assessment in line with minimum standard in the GEF policy: https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/Docs/Policy_Environmental_and_Social_Safeguards_0.pdf ES, 11/10/15: It has been clarified that no Cement Kilns will be used in this project. - Comment Cleared For the national expert group that will be supported under the project how will this be coordinated with existing capacity in the country, such as the Stockholm Convention Focal Point? Also, will this group continue to function after this project? Will it be mainstreamed to build sustainable national capacity? ES, 9/4/15: The national expert group has been clarified. -Comment cleared
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning	Yes, this is clear. 1600 tons of PCB contaminated equipment and 200 tons PCB oil will be disposed of.	During PIF stage it was estimated that 200 tons of PCB oil would be disposed, now the project says 200 tons of PCB equipment. How do the two differ? The

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?		project proposal also lists 1600 tons of PCB contaminated equipment. How is this different from the 200 tons of PCB equipment? The costs for handling 200 tons of PCB oil is significantly different from 200 tons of equipment. Are these differences accounted for in the project? Incremental reasoning is difficult to determine because the baseline is not clear. ES, 9/4/15: This has been clarified. - Comment cleared
	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?		A description of gender and socioeconomic benefits is provided.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes.	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	The risk associated with the cement kiln is listed as low. Trying to find additional resources to upgrade the facility may pose a serious risk to the successful implementation of this project. Are there air emission regulations already existing that would regulate this type of activity?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			ES, 9/4/15: See comments under question 7 ES, 11/10/15: Comment cleared
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	A list of coordinated activities is provided.
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • 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.	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.	Information on sustainability and potential for scale up is not included. ES, 9/4/15: Sustainability will be achieved through mainstreaming project components into national activities. - Comment cleared
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The structure is similar to what was presented in the PIF, however there does not seem to have been much further development since the PIF stage during the PPG. There is a list of what the money of the PPG was spent on but not what the outcomes were. ES, 9/4/15: PPG outcomes have been provided, however PPG activities have not covered the activities needed to determine sound destruction technology. ES, 11/10/15: Cement kiln technology

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			will not be used. Comment cleared
	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?		The cost effectiveness in relation to the amount of GEBs is unclear due to the lack in precision in what is actually being disposed off in the project, and there are some uncertainties about cost effectiveness since there are still many questions about the technologies used in the project, especially the cement kiln. ES, 9/4/15: GEBs and cost effectiveness are clear. -Comment cleared
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.	Yes, there is significant co-funding including cash. The private sector is providing significant co-funding. ES, 9/4/15: There is one co-financing letter from Fonchem International which is not accounted for in Table C. ES, 11/10/15: Table C has been updated. -Comment cleared
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	Co-financing is appropriate and significant co-financing comes from the private sector, the electrical facility.	Yes, co financing letters are provided.
	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	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		5% and agency fee is 9.5%. Comment cleared.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, PPG is requested.	There is a list of what the funds of the PPG was spend on but not what the outcomes were. ES, 9/4/15: Outcomes have been provided. -Comment cleared
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		ES, 11/12/15: Comments were received by the US and Canada. Please provide a response to these comments. https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/Compilation%20of%20Comment%20submitted%20by%20Council%20Members%20on%20the%20November%202013%20Work%20Program.pdf

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			ES, 12/8/15: Response to comments provided. -Comments cleared
	• Other GEF Agencies?		None received
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/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		There are a number of issues identified during the review that needs to be addressed before moving forward with this proposal. ES, 9/4/15: Not at this time. There are questions regarding the disposal plan. ES, 11/10/15: Not at this time. Council comments should be considered. ES, 12/8/15: CEO Endorsement is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 12, 2013	June 10, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 15, 2013	September 04, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		November 10, 2015

* **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.**