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The "building blocks" in this series are part of the continuing discussion inaugurated at the UNCED Conference in Rio on building environmentally sustainable development in Africa. The conclusions in these papers are not definitive; nor do their views and interpretations necessarily reflect the opinions of the World Bank or any of its affiliated organizations.
Foreword

Which environmental issues make development unsustainable in Sub-Saharan Africa, and how do African societies perceive and address these issues? How has the World Bank helped its Africa borrowers to integrate environment into their development strategies and programs? And what must the Bank do to help African countries achieve environmentally sustainable development (ESD)?

Inspired by the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio, the Bank has launched a reflection process to answer these questions. In its reflection the Bank is guided by the message of Rio: without improved environmental management, development will be undermined, and without accelerated development in poor countries—which describes most of Sub-Saharan Africa—the environment will continue to degrade.

This process seeks to define the Bank’s medium-term agenda for helping its Sub-Saharan Africa borrowers attain ESD. It aims at enriching Bank staff’s dialogue with African counterparts about improving the conception and implementation of Bank ESD programs. The process should also gain the interest of a much wider audience, including an array of prominent institutions—both African and non-African as well as public and private—universities, NGOs, and bilateral and multilateral agencies. It should encourage a debate on environmental issues which would forge wide support for new African initiatives toward ESD.

Space and time determine the process. Environmental issues are location-specific and therefore require integrating the geographic dimension. With respect to time, the process has focused on both past and future historical perspectives. The future time horizon is 2025, i.e., 30 years, corresponding roughly to a generation. Backward, the process focuses on the past decade, and the Bank’s association with Africa, in order to measure the full magnitude of environmental issues.

Within this process, about 20 thematic “building blocks” have been compiled, each addressing a specific facet of ESD issues. These “blocks,” prepared by specialists from inside and outside the Bank, fall into five categories: population, environmental knowledge, urban environment, natural resource management, and strategic instruments. The building blocks series has been the basis for the preparation of a World Bank discussion paper: Toward Environmentally Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa—a World Bank Perspective, which will be published in late 1995.
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Sub-Saharan Africa is the fastest urbanizing region in the world. Fast-growing cities are experiencing a range of environmental problems similar to other areas of the world that have experienced rapid urbanization. This growth, combined with large populations that will continue to live in towns and villages, will also put increased pressure on rural ecosystems. Thus, there is a need for environmental management at the sub-national level. While the Bank’s Africa region has begun to address local environmental issues in some countries through lending and sector work, there has been relatively little exchange of information, expertise and experience between African localities themselves. In other regions, there are successful networks that link communities concerned with environmental issues and assist with the preparation and implementation of local environmental action plans. These networks, through their support for local environmental management, can help improve the way the Bank does business. Options and next steps are proposed for creating an African network, Managing the Environment Locally in Sub-Saharan Africa (MELISSA).
## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFTES</td>
<td>Africa Environmentally Sustainable Development Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGETIP</td>
<td>Agence pour l'Execution des Travaux dans l'Interet Publique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCEN</td>
<td>African Ministers Concerned with the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTEN</td>
<td>Asia Environment &amp; Natural Resources Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAGU</td>
<td>Institut African de Gestion Urbaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLEI</td>
<td>International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IULA</td>
<td>International Union of Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>Local Environmental Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDP</td>
<td>Municipal Development Program (for Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEIP</td>
<td>UNDP/WB Metropolitan Environmental Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELISSA</td>
<td>Managing the Environment Locally in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAP</td>
<td>National Environmental Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESDA</td>
<td>Network for Environmentally Sustainable Development in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWURD</td>
<td>Urban Development Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMP</td>
<td>UNCHS/World Bank/UNDP Urban Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCED</td>
<td>UN Conference on Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCHS</td>
<td>UN Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>UN Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Background

Sub-Saharan Africa is the fastest urbanizing region in the world. Sub-regional urbanization rates range from 3.2 percent in Southern Africa to 5.3 percent in Western Africa for the 1990-95 period. Between 22 percent (Eastern Africa) and 48 percent (Southern Africa) of SSA residents were estimated to be living in cities in 1995. There are now 185 million city dwellers in the region; by the year 2025, this is expected to more than triple to 678 million or over half (52 percent) of the region's total population. In 1995, 133 million people (or 72 percent of urban residents) were estimated to be living in cities with populations under one million; by 2010, the percentage would drop to two-thirds or 248 million people living in smaller cities (UN, 1993). Thus, urbanization in SSA is here to stay and will result in a majority of the region's population living in cities over the next thirty years.

Across the region, this growth is manifesting itself in different types of cities. As the previous paragraph indicates, most urban residents are and will continue to live in small cities and towns scattered throughout the region. By the year 2020, SSA is projected to have 8000 towns with a population between 5000 and 50,000, and more than a thousand smaller cities of between 50,000 and 500,000 inhabitants. At the other end of the scale, in West Africa a megalopolis is emerging between Ibadan and Accra with some 50 million people spread over a distance of 500 kilometers, encompassing the region's largest city, Lagos. Next, there are several large conurbations that are emerging: Gauteng province incorporating Johannesburg and Pretoria, the Niger delta and southern Ibo area between Benin City, Port Harcourt, Calabar, and Enugu, and the copper belt between Lubumbashi and Ndola. Then, there are a number of regional cities that will grow to more than five million citizens before the year 2025, including Abidjan, Addis Ababa, Dar es Salaam, Khartoum, Kinshasa, Luanda, and Nairobi. Outside of these three classifications, there are many large urban areas that are primary or capital cities (e.g., Conakry, Dakar, Douala, Maputo) or secondary but still large cities such as Cape Town and Durban (modified from Venard, 1994).

The urban areas of SSA are experiencing a range of environmental problems that have occurred in other areas of the world which have undergone rapid urbanization. These include: the inability of physical infrastructure and services to keep pace with population growth; the health consequences of crowding and increased exposure to concentrated wastes; unsustainable resource consumption; and greater settlement on environmentally fragile lands. In addition, the environmental consequences of rapid urbanization have been affected by features that are peculiar to African cities themselves. These issues are more fully explored in Urbanization and Environment in Sub-Saharan Africa (Leitmann, 1995).

At the same time, a significant portion of sub-Saharan Africa will continue to reside in small towns and villages in rural areas. This rural population, combined with growing urban demand for rural resources such as food, water, wood and mineral resources, will put greater pressure on rural ecosystems. Thus, there is an important need for local management of the environment beyond cities.

Between 1972 and 1991, the World Bank's urban investment programs in SSA have addressed environmental improvements primarily through either urban development projects that concentrated on slum upgrading or sites and services programs, or water and sanitation projects. The number and scope of these projects did not seem to have made a positive improvement in
urban environmental quality throughout the region. Long-term and significant impact may not have been achieved because many technical improvements were planned and implemented without the necessary institutional capacity building, stakeholder participation, and cross-media and cross-sectoral perspective. However, the situation in individual cities may have been worse off without the Bank interventions.

Since 1992 some World Bank investments in urban environmental improvements in the SSA region have demonstrated a more strategic and integrated approach. During the FY1991-94 period, project lending with an urban environmental focus included investments in urban waste management (sanitation, drainage, solid waste management), and urban transportation to reduce congestion and improve road safety, particularly for the urban poor. To increase effectiveness, a number of projects included support for broader improvements in institutional capacity for urban management as well as greater involvement by the private sector, NGOs, and community groups. The projects involved improvements in land management, support for institution building, increased private sector participation in providing urban infrastructure and environmental services, and the involvement of local communities in project planning.

An analysis of the FY1991-94 portfolio of SSA projects concluded that urban environmental management was not a principal objective of infrastructure, environment, or industry and energy lending (Bernstein, 1995). There were only two free-standing urban environmental projects. However, there were another seven projects with a primary focus on urban environmental issues and 29 projects with at least one component that sought to improve the quality of a city's environment. The following trends were observed for these projects that had urban environmental objectives or components:

- **Lack of strategic framework** - the projects did not result from a strategic planning process. None provided support for urban environmental planning, though some financing was provided for land use planning or planning of sanitation or solid waste services. Planning of service delivery, e.g., privatization of solid waste management, was often left until late in project preparation. Very few projects referred to relevant provisions in the country's national environmental action plan.

- **Use of community participation** - unlike earlier investments in urban environmental services, a number of projects included provisions for involving stakeholders in the planning of urban services, e.g., Mali Public Works and Capacity Building, Mauritania Construction Capacity and Employment, and Uganda Small Towns Water and Sanitation.

- **Private sector promotion** - several projects support the development of a private agency to facilitate contracts to local firms to carry out urban services, provide infrastructure, and generate employment. AGETIP-like agencies have been supported in Senegal, Benin, Burkina Faso, and Mali.

- **Urban poverty focus** - Numerous projects addressed the need to improve affordability of urban environmental improvements to low-income residents. These include
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Country environmental strategy papers as well as economic and sector work during this period paid relatively little attention to urban environmental issues despite worsening urban environmental degradation throughout the region. Notable exceptions include: (a) the urban sector and country assistance strategies for Côte d'Ivoire which recognize urban environmental degradation as an important priority and recommend policy reforms, investments, governance measures, and institutional development options; (b) the Senegal urban environment and country environment strategy papers focus on growing urbanization and associated environmental problems along with appropriate recommendations; (c) the Mauritania country environmental strategy paper (CESP) stresses the poverty impact of urban environmental deterioration and places medium-to-high priority on protection of urban aquifers and waste management; (d) the Chad CESP has a major focus on urban pollution with groundwater contamination and drainage as top priorities; and (e) the Mali CESP addresses certain urban environmental issues, with recommendations concerning water management and pollution control, popular participation in urban planning, and public education.

Almost all of the Bank-assisted National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs) and similar documents in SSA countries deal with urban environmental issues to some extent. Problems common to most of the countries included inadequate water supply, sanitation, drainage, solid waste management, and transportation systems. Very few indicated problems associated with higher levels of development such as hazardous wastes and ambient air pollution. Urban environmental issues were identified as serious problems in the NEAPs for Benin, The Gambia, Kenya, Mozambique, and Sierra Leone. The World Bank has assisted with NEAP implementation to address these problems in Benin (Urban Rehabilitation and Management Project), Burkina Faso (Urban Environment Project), and The Gambia (Urban Environment Project).

While the Bank's Africa region has begun to address urban environmental issues in some countries through lending and sector work, there has been relatively little exchange of information, expertise, and experience between African cities themselves. In other regions, there are networks that link cities concerned with environmental issues, e.g., the Metropolitan Environmental Improvement Program in Asia and the MEDCITIES Program in the Mediterranean basin. No such network exists for the cities of Sub-Saharan Africa. Instead, there are more general urban programs, such as the Municipal Development Program or the Urban Management Program for Africa, centers for urban development (e.g., the Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine) or the environment (e.g., the Mazingira Institute), and environmental networks such as NESDA.

These programs make occasional forays into urban environmental issues with instructive results. For example, the UMP/Africa program recently sponsored a week-long workshop on urban environmental management which 60 technical professionals and 11 national ministers attended (Dakar; June 26-30, 1995). Some tentative conclusions are:

- there is relatively little exchange of knowledge between cities, particularly between Anglophone and Francophone countries
• SSA cities are undertaking a range of urban environmental interventions with a broad but unconnected set of partners (e.g., the UNCHS Sustainable Cities Program, Dutch aid, the UNDP/Bank Regional Water and Sanitation Program, the ICLEI Local Agenda 21 Initiative, the UMP/Africa Program, IAGU).

• There are useful examples of good and not-so-good practice of urban environmental planning and management in SSA cities (12 case studies were prepared and presented at the workshop).

• There are no opportunities for African cities to systematically work and learn from one another directly, other than through occasional international meetings, training courses and infrequent twinning arrangements.
II. Making the Jump from NEAPs to LEAPs

NEAPs have been completed for most IDA borrowers in the region. They generally identify national-level issues and options for environmental management. Occasionally, they also focus on particular local environmental problems that are so severe as to have national significance. However, they do not provide a clear way forward for assisting specific local areas to identify, prioritize, and act on environmental issues. NEAPs were not designed to accomplish this.

There is an unmet need, as noted in the post-UNCED report (AFTES 1995) to prepare and implement local environmental action plans (LEAPs) in Sub-Saharan Africa. This need should be fulfilled because:

- the effects of environmental problems are most concentrated in cities and urgently require management
- the solutions to most national (and even global) environmental problems must begin with local action
- a mechanism is needed to push the NEAP process to the local level in order to update and implement NEAPs
- environmental problems that are so often cross-sectoral and multijurisdictional in nature can be better addressed through a strategic LEAP than by uncoordinated sectoral interventions
- with growing decentralization in SSA, local governments are increasingly willing and able to undertake and follow through with their own plans of action.

Without LEAPs, there will be less chance of mobilizing resources to address priority environmental problems in rapidly growing African cities, villages, and regions. With LEAPs, there will be a better chance for localities and the Bank to get results in the field.

While there are several different styles of preparing a local environmental action plan, most contain the following generic elements and steps:

1. **clarifying environmental issues to be addressed**, e.g., through rapid assessment of environmental conditions and factors based on existing information;
2. **involving those whose cooperation is required**, e.g., by a participatory process whereby stakeholders identify priorities, options, constraints, and opportunities;
3. **setting priorities** through a process that recognizes and reconciles scientific, political, and popularly perceived conclusions;
4. **negotiating issue-specific strategies** to solve priority problems through the involvement of key stakeholders;
5. **agreeing on environmental action plans** that translate issue-specific strategies into actor-specific plans of action; and
6. **implementing change** by initiating priority programs, projects and policies, strengthening institutional capacity, and monitoring progress.
These constitute a strategic approach to urban environmental management; they are summarized in a Bank publication (Bartone et al. 1994) and are being incorporated in Bank lending. In Africa, this process rarely occurs spontaneously; it is usually catalyzed, supported or required by an external program. Such programs often draw on global experience but do not necessarily refer to regional experience.

There would be several advantages to a regional network that could support the development and implementation of LEAPs. African localities would have access to relevant experience from other communities that have similar levels of socioeconomic development, ecological conditions and colonial histories, with attendant constraints and opportunities. Cities, villages or regions with a need to develop LEAPs could receive direct assistance from an entity that was expressly designed to support sub-national environmental initiatives, rather than trying to reorient a particular donor or more general urban or environmental program. Technical assistance and other costs could be reduced as travel, communications, salaries, and other expenses would be on a regional rather than an international scale. Capacity for environmental planning and management could be strengthened through exchanges of staff, procedures, and experiences.

From the Bank perspective, a LEAP network would offer additional advantages. The network could serve as a repository of good practice for preparing and implementing LEAPs which task managers could consult for lending and sector work. Specific LEAPs that were facilitated through the network could serve as the basis for lending operations, either on a stand-alone basis or as components of larger projects. This would, in turn, help the Bank improve its ability to get results in the field through infrastructure, environment, and other projects that could build on LEAPs. The transaction costs of preparing LEAPs would be less burdensome for interested task managers with a network that served as an effective partner for technical assistance. When properly done, the LEAP approach can facilitate project preparation and sector work, often more so than a technocratic approach that is expert-driven and top-down.
III. Options for MELISSA

Managing the Environment Locally in Sub-Saharan Africa, or MELISSA, is an appealing acronym. Its substance—getting better, faster, and more sustainable results in the field—is even more compelling. The overall goal of creating MELISSA would be to improve the quality of life at the local level, especially for low-income residents, through environmental protection and management. This could be achieved by pursuing a range of objectives including:

- Establishing a regional network
- Assisting with preparation of environmental management strategies and local environmental action plans
- Stimulating follow-up investment
- Institutional strengthening of member cities and localities
- Reinforcing processes of decentralization and public participation

These objectives are not mutually exclusive and are often interlinked. Also, they can apply equally to large cities and small rural local authorities as well as non-governmental entities.

Operationally, MELISSA could undertake a range of functions to achieve these objectives. Possible activities include:

- supporting the creation of an electronic network of Internet and Web connections between African communities (both within and outside of local government)
- encouraging twinning arrangements within the region and/or between SSA local governments and localities outside of the region
- mobilizing regional and international technical assistance to support the preparation of local environmental assessments, management strategies, and action plans
- documenting and disseminating cases of good practice
- linking action plans with investment opportunities
- developing tools for assessing and managing the environment at the local level
- supporting policy analyses and processes of policy reform
- monitoring environmental conditions across SSA cities, villages and regions

The range of activities undertaken will vary between local areas that are members of MELISSA according to their institutional capacity, degree of political commitment to improving environmental quality, and range of environmental problems encountered. While functions may differ, a consistent set of indicators should be collected, monitored and analyzed to assess progress over time.

There are at least three options which could be pursued to create and operate a network that promotes local environmental management in Sub-Saharan Africa: (a) centralized network of locally-based coordinators managed by the Bank; (b) a regional network of communities that is initially organized and supervised by the Bank; or (c) a locally-managed network whose creation and financing are facilitated by the Bank. The characteristics of each dif-
The examples listed in Table 3.1 refer to existing programs that have created local environmental networks and which embodied the different styles of management. The Metropolitan Environmental Improvement Program (MEIP) is a centrally-managed network based in ASTEN. National program coordinators are hired by ASTEN in each city to organize local activities and studies. ASTEN staff raise funds, prepare work programs, organize meetings, promote communications between coordinators, assemble publications, report to external support agencies (UNDP and bilateral donors), and conduct research. The Urban Management Program (UMP) hires regional coordinators who then create networks (panels of regional experts and institutions in five substantive areas). The networks identify local demand for consultations and technical assistance; the coordinators then prepare and manage work programs to meet that demand. The core program members (UNCHS (Habitat) and TWURD at the Bank) are responsible for synthesis of experience across regions, global research, publications, and global fundraising, with the UNDP responsible for program evaluation. The Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine (IAGU) receives funding from the Swiss Development Corporation to undertake a three-year work program. A regional coordinator and his staff are responsible for drafting, implementing, and modifying the work program in response to local demands or windows of opportunity to work with other regional partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX 3.1: Options for MELISSA</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Bank task manager supervising local coordinators</td>
<td>Bank task manager initially stimulates creation of network; regional coordinator hired to manage</td>
<td>Bank task manager mobilizes/facilitates transfer of funds to local network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>MEIP</td>
<td>UMP</td>
<td>IAGU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>High degree of control over quality and programming; strong link to Bank activities</td>
<td>Limited demand on Bank staff; some control of quality &amp; programming</td>
<td>Very little demand on Bank staff; maximizes local autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Supervision &amp; travel-intensive; may be too focused on Bank activities</td>
<td>Requires availability of appropriate task manager; may not link enough with Bank activities</td>
<td>Very little control over quality and programming; risk of little/no link to Bank activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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One could imagine a fourth option that overcomes some of the limitations of the first three approaches while maintaining many of their advantages. This fourth alternative would require the efforts of a Bank task manager to mobilize funds for the operation of a network. However, it would build on an existing network of African localities (e.g., IULA, Cités Unies/United Towns, UMP, MDP) rather than investing in the creation of a new network. Initially, the task manager would supervise the use of resources to support activities identified in consultation with the network. A regional coordinator would be identified jointly with the network who would gradually assume responsibility for day-to-day programming, quality control, and linkage with Bank activities. This fourth option would allow the Bank to help ensure the quality and utility of initial outputs with the goal of gradually decentralizing management of the network while still maintaining links to the Bank. This is more or less the approach that was taken in supporting and implementing activities of the MEDCITIES network (see Box 3.1). The major decision in pursuing this organizational model will be to select the most appropriate existing network to support (or to support a collaborative effort of several networks), along with the choice of an effective regional coordinator.

**BOX 3.1: MEDCITIES**

MEDCITIES, or the Mediterranean Coastal Cities Network, is a regional network of twenty cities that have come together to work toward combating common environmental problems and to promote sound environmental practices in the region. The main objectives of MEDCITIES are:

- protection of coastal city environments
- municipal institutional strengthening
- creation of town-to-town partnerships
- preparation of municipal environment plans
- developing dialogues, tools & policies
- mobilizing resources & preparing investments

The mayors of member cities meet annually to discuss progress and future network activities. The meetings are organized by the United Towns Development Agency.

During its first phase, MEDCITIES conducted participative environmental audits and formulated environmental strategies in five member cities. This process was managed by EMTES with funding from the Commission of European Communities. Cities shared in the cost by providing local consultants, office space, publication and dissemination of audit materials, and organization of consultations. Other member cities provided their own experts through twinning arrangements with audit cities.

During a second phase, actions plans are being prepared in the five cities plus Tirana. EMTES is supervising the use of funds but the relevant SODs are managing preparation of the action plans due to existing investment linkages. The network is expanding and, in a third phase, will itself manage the preparation of audits and action plans in an additional 5-6 member cities.
IV. Next Steps

Several steps have already been taken on the road to creating MELISSA. A draft version of this concept paper was circulated to relevant parties within the Bank for review and comment, including GTIV and GT Environment, appropriate urban and environmental task managers in the region, select staff in AFTES and ESD, and staff working on related programs (e.g., MDP, UMP, MEIP, MEDCITIES). The reviewers then discussed the content and process of developing MELISSA, concluding that a revised concept paper should be widely disseminated to generate interest and support, and a funding proposal should be developed during the latter half of September for submission to the European Commission (EC).

The concept paper should be quickly disseminated, especially to potential partners. Dissemination could occur through existing networks (e.g., the MDP, UMP, NESDA), sub-regional workshops and existing events. In October alone, opportunities for dissemination exist at the ESD 3rd annual conference on sustainable development (Washington, DC; October 4-6), the regional meeting of African ministers for Habitat II (Johannesburg; October 16-20), the MDP/MDP sub-regional seminar on solid waste management (Abidjan; October 25-27), and the meeting of African ministers in charge of environment (AMCEN) conference (Harare; late October).

Regarding financing, Jean-Roger Mercier has had recent meetings with the EC (June 22, 1995) where interest in supporting MELISSA was expressed by representatives of DG VIII which deals with the Africa-Caribbean-Pacific countries. The DG would be willing to receive a proposal by the Bank for a pilot phase which could receive up to 400,000 ECU (about US$600,000) in EC financing. Denise Vaudaine will be visiting Brussels by early October to discuss a proposal with the EC.

The content of the financing proposal would follow the format recommended by the EC (see Annex). It would include: (a) an introduction that summarizes the proposal and its administrative details (cost, location, duration); (b) the context (political, socioeconomic, intended beneficiaries, interests of stakeholders); (c) a scope of work (objectives, expected results, key activities, resource requirements, implementation schedule); (d) a budget; (e) justification; and (f) a monitoring plan.

The process for preparing the financing proposal would include a number of steps:

1. discussion of the concept with potential institutional anchors for MELISSA (as discussed, these might include the MDP, UMP, IAGU, IULA, Cités Unies/United Towns, Mazingira Institute, NESDA, or a coalition of several partners);
2. discussion of the concept with external partners that might be interested in supporting the network (e.g., OECD, UNCHS (Habitat), UNEP, ICLEI, UNDP/Bank RWSG, African Development Bank, African Environmental Research and Consulting Consortium) as well as internally with Bank task managers;

3. preparation of the actual proposal following the EC guidelines;

4. identification of localities that might serve as initial members of the network. These should be selected through competition from within the geographical hot spots identified by the AFTES post-UNCED analysis (see Box 4.1);

5. internal and external review and revisions; and

6. submission to the EC.

Steps 1-3 could be accomplished during the latter half of September. Review and revision could take place in October, with submission of a proposal to the EC in November. Step 4 could be initiated at any time but will take several months. African local authorities and non-governmental groups would be invited to submit proposals to become charter members of the network as an expression of their interest and capacity to participate. This "competitive" approach was particularly successful when ICLEI established its Local Agenda 21 program. If the funding proposal is successful, then the initial member cities, the EC and the Bank could officially launch MELISSA at the Habitat II UN conference (Istanbul; June 1996).
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COMMENT PRESENTER UN DOSSIER ?

Les demandes de financement doivent être présentées en trois exemplaires, de préférence en langues anglaise, française ou espagnole.

Le dossier devra être présenté en conformité avec le cadre logique (voir annexe II ci-joint) et devra comprendre :

DES RENSEIGNEMENTS SUR LE REQUERANT :

- statut juridique
- rapport annuel d'activité
- bilan financier annuel
- expérience dans les domaines se rapportant au projet (liste des projets...)
- CV des experts participants

DES RENSEIGNEMENTS SUR L’ACTION :

Description détaillée du projet présenté, incluant :

1. Une fiche synthétique, qui consistera en une page de garde avec :
   - le titre du projet;
   - le lieu du projet (avec le cas échéant une illustration cartographique);
   - la durée du projet;
     est considérée comme normale une durée de :
     - 3 à 12 mois pour une étude ou une expertise,
     - 12 à 24 mois pour un programme de recherche ou de formation,
     - 2 à 3 ans pour un projet comportant la réalisation d'action sur le terrain;
   - le nom du requérant;
   - le montant total du projet, de la contribution communautaire sollicitée et des autres sources de financement prévues;
   - un résumé du projet, avec l'analyse des problèmes que le projet cherche à résoudre.

2. Un cadre logique (voir Annexe II) pour chaque projet d'un montant supérieur à 450 000 Ecus.
3. Le contexte

- le contexte politique, socio-économique, ...
- les bénéficiaires et acteurs principaux,
- l’analyse de leurs intérêts.

4. Description de l’action

4.1. Les objectifs (une page)

- l'objectif global,
- les objectifs spécifiques.

4.2. Les résultats (une page)

Enumération détaillée des résultats à obtenir à la fin du projet, à savoir par exemple les zones à protéger, le nombre de personnes formées, les plans de gestion à long terme, les cartes et autres documents produits, les équipements laissés dans le pays, les rapports et règles normatives établis, ...

4.3. Mise en œuvre du projet

- Le programme opérationnel
  il énumère les activités entreprises pendant la durée totale du projet.
- Les moyens
  - les moyens en personnel (personnel expatrié et/ou local, homme/mois, qualifications et expériences),
  - les moyens en matériel (équipements achetés pour la réalisation du projet).
- Le calendrier
  présenté sous forme de chronogramme, il donne la durée de chaque activité entreprise pour la réalisation du projet.

5. Le budget

Considérations générales

La contribution communautaire peut dans des cas exceptionnels atteindre jusqu'à 100% des coûts de l'action. Une contribution du requérant et si possible d'autres donateurs est toujours souhaitable.

Le montant de la contribution communautaire se situe, sauf cas exceptionnel, entre 100 000 ECU (montant minimum) et 1 000 000 ECU (montant maximum).

Le budget ne peut en aucun cas couvrir des dépenses effectuées avant la signature du contrat.
Présentation
Le budget doit être présenté selon le formulaire et la description figurant à l'Annexe I.

6. Justification

- Justification du projet axée sur la durabilité des résultats du projet et la possibilité d'évaluer et de reproduire ailleurs ces résultats.
- Adéquation des objectifs aux résultats à atteindre et aux moyens à utiliser.

7. Modalités de suivi

Calendrier de soumission des rapports, en conformité avec le rythme de mise en œuvre de l'action.

A QUI ADRESSER SA DEMANDE ?

Les dossiers devront être adressés à :

Pour les actions situées dans les P.V.D.
d'Amérique Latine, d'Asie
et de la Méditerranée

Commission des Communautés Européennes
Direction Générale des Relations Économiques Extérieures (DGI)
Unité I-K-2 - Secteur Environnement
Rue de la Science, 14
B-1040 BRUXELLES
BELGIQUE
Tél.: 32 2/ 299 07 11
Téléfax: 32 2/ 299 09 14

Pour les actions situées dans les P.V.D. d'Afrique, des Caraïbes,
du Pacifique et des Pays et Territoires d'Outre Mer

Commission des Communautés Européennes
Direction Générale du Développement (DGVIII)
Unité VIII-A-1
Rue de Genève, 12
B-1140 BRUXELLES
BELGIQUE
Tél.: 32 2/ 295 13 55
Téléfax.:32 2/ 299 29 07