



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

GEF ID:	4641		
Country/Region:	Cameroon		
Project Title:	ASP2 Disposal of POPs and Obsolete Pesticides and Strengthening Sound Pesticide Management		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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; CHEM-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,710,000
Co-financing:	\$7,548,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,258,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	February 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jie Pan	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Ammati

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 Stockholm Convention on May 19, 2009.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. GEF OFP has endorsed the project on May 13, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. FAO is experienced in implementing projects on obsolete POPs and contaminated sites.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The project fits into FAO's Strategic Objective. The project will be supported by 2 FAO field programme officers and administrative and	

*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)
		operations team in Cameroon office. FAO subregional office for Central Africa will also provide implementation support.	
Resource Availability	6. 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)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. CHEM-1 and CHEM-3.	
	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?	Cameroon's NIP is still under development. At CEO endorsement stage, NIP should be submitted to SSC.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	This proposed project will build capacities in Cameroon through development and implementation of safeguarding and disposal strategy and site specific remediation strategy, training a national team for the compliance of Conventions requirements, development and pilot of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a container management scheme, strengthening institutional and regulatory framework, and promotion of IPM alternatives. However, it is not clear how the capacity developed can be utilized to promote sustainability of project outcomes when the project is completed. Please elaborate on how the above-mentioned outcomes can be incorporated and mainstreamed into national pesticides management strategy, or any other measures to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>Dec.13, 2011_ Addressed. Establishment of national committee for obsolete pesticide control. promotion of IPM, wide stakeholder participation, and courses/trainings will all contribute to project sustainability.</p>	
Project Design	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>Description of problems well supports activities to address the need for pesticides management system, training of farmers, disposal of stockpiles, development of remediation strategy, and treatment of contaminated sites. However, GEF expects more description on country situation to assess activities in relation to container management system and promotion of IPM, for example, the quantity of contaminated containers and malpractice with chemical pesticides.</p> <p>It is mentioned that "DDT and Lindane are subject to illegal trafficking and use in agriculture and public health." If</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>that's the case, this fact might be identified as one of the risks with IPM introduction and proper countermeasure needs to be raised.</p> <p>Dec.13, 2011_ Addressed.</p> <p>Legacy containers will be safeguarded under this project and GEF expects to have more details on new contaminated containers at CEO endorsement stage. IPM component is sufficiently explained and proper countermeasures are raised to support IPM, including how to mitigate the risk of illegal trafficking.</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Incrementality of GEF funding will be further evaluated after comments on project design are clarified.</p> <p>Jan. 5 2012 Addressed</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Comments are made component by component.</p> <p>Component 1: A total of 1.3 million is allocated to this component which includes the disposal of 300 tons of stocks and implementation of a contaminated site remediation strategy. The size of site to be remediated through the project needs to be provided. At CEO endorsement stage,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>justification of disposal/remediation cost is needed.</p> <p>Component 2: 2.1 Such a scheme already exists in a few countries. Is it possible to adapt existing ones to Cameroon instead of developing a new one? Please clarify.</p> <p>2.2. Will such a network for container be included in any major national plan?</p> <p>2.3. GEFSEC expects FAO to provide information on equipment to be purchased at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Component 4: The necessity of this component needs to be justified based on country situation. The risk posed by illegal trafficking needs to be properly identified and dealt with. What are the targeted sector for IPM promotion? What are the criteria for selecting IPM technology? What are the components of the IPM technology in Cameroon? What is the associated cost?</p> <p>Dec.13, 2011_</p> <p>Component 1: Addressed. FAO will be able to confirm the number, size and priority sites at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Component 2 and 4: Well explained.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes.	
	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, socio-economic benefits are clearly described.	

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 indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. The role of stakeholders, including CSOs, is properly identified.	
	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)	Major risks are identified and countermeasures are provided. Potential risks accompanying the introduction of IPM need to be identified as well. Dec.13, 2011_ FAO expressed that there is no risk with the introduction of IPM in the country taken into account previous successful experience.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	There is no description of implementation/execution arrangement. Dec.13, 2011_ Addressed.	
	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	9.94% of GEF grant.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	management cost appropriate?	<p>Jan.5, 2011</p> <p>In addition, GEF contribution vs. cofinancing contribution should be strictly comparable to the overall cofinancing ratio of the project, which is 1:4.41. Please adjust.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Component 1: co-financing ratio is 1:1:17. This component carries out the bulk of disposal and remediation work. At CEO endorsement stage, justification of disposal/remediation cost is needed. Component 3: 25% of resources (0.35 million from GEF, 1.118 million from co-financing) will be used for component 3 on capacity building (update legislation, training 40 officers, identification and implementation of measures to operationalize national phytosanitary council and establishment of national registration network). Please justify how these activities can cost the allocated resources.</p> <p>Component 4: The co-financing ratio of component 4 (1:4) on IPM will be further evaluated after receiving information on project design rationale.</p> <p>Dec.13, 2011_</p> <p>GEF is not convinced the current co-financing per objective is appropriate. For example, a total of 1.3 million USD (0.6m GEF, 0.7m Co-financing) is allocated to component 1 which among many other activities covers disposal of 300 tons of stocks and remediation of contaminated sites. Quoting FAO's</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>highest unit price for disposal (4000 USD per ton), disposal itself will cost 1.2 million. There will be around 0.1 million left for training, development of strategies, etc, not to mention the costly remediation of contaminated sites. Co-financing for this component needs to be raised to a much higher reasonable level to address GEF's concern.</p> <p>Component 3 (on legislation update, training 40 officers, operationalize a coordination council, and establishment of registration network) has a very high co-financing ratio and total allocation is more than component 1. FAO justified that this council needs technical and laboratory capacities for diagnosis, yet Project framework states clearly that it is for coordination. In addition, government input of 1.5 million has been allocated to elevate lab capacity. Budget for this component is advised to be reduced to a reasonable level.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>Co-financing ratio stands at 1:2.47. FAO is advised to work with the GoC and bring up overall co-financing to GEF5 expectation of 1:4.</p> <p>Dec. 13, 2011_ Not addressed.</p> <p>The co-financing ratio of 1:4 is a GEF requirement at PIF stage. Agencies are encouraged to further bring up co-financing during project preparation.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, FAO will provide \$900k in cash co-financing.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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 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>Pending submission of a revised PIF addressing GEFSEC comments.</p> <p>Dec.13, 2011_ Not at this stage, remaining issues are to be addressed.</p> <p>Jan. 5, 2012 Will be recommended once PMC is adjusted.</p> <p>Jan. 9, 2012 PIF clearance is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Cameroon's NIP is still under development. At CEO endorsement stage, NIP should be submitted to SSC. Justification of disposal/remediation cost is needed. The number, size and priority sites for remediation is needed at CEO endorsement stage.	
Recommendation at	32. At endorsement/approval, did		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
CEO Endorsement/ Approval	Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.