

United Nations**Nations Unies**

United Nations
Multidimensional Integrated
Stabilization Mission in the
Central African Republic

MINUSCA

Mission Multidimensionnelle
Intégrée des Nations Unies
pour la Stabilisation en
République centrafricaine

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM**MEMORANDUM INTERIEUR**

TO: Mr. Milan Trajanovic
A: Director of Mission Support

DATE: 03 October 2016

REFERENCE: CSD/025/16

THROUGH:

S/C DE:

FROM: Braima Jamanca,
DE: Chief Service Delivery

SUBJECT: **MINUSCA Waste Management Status Update and Risks**
OBJET:

1. I would like to refer to the DMS report on waste management that was sent to USG/DFS on 19 September 2016 for which Service Delivery Office was never consulted and in which the Mission appreciated the support from the Environmental Engineering and Compliance Unit from UNGSC albeit that their recommendations to establish and equip Waste Management Yards is still in a state of paralysis.

2. Currently, the Mission and its contractors are dumping non-toxic solid waste in Kolongo dumpsite on temporary basis pending the establishment of its own Waste Management Yards. However, it must be noted that Kolongo is too small to handle both the Mission and the Bangui and Bimbo Municipalities generated garbage, especially when the Bangui and Bimbo Municipalities resume dumping their garbage at the dumpsite in full swing. Although the Government authorized the Mission to use the dumpsite, the Mission has no control of the dumpsite, therefore the garbage volumes are unknown and there is no guarantee of its availability in the medium to long term. In fact, recently, the Mission was stopped from further dumping waste at Kolongo, when the UNOE bulldozer broke down for two weeks and the Mission was stuck without alternative dumping site. It should be noted that the Bangui Municipality has not had a serviceable bulldozer for a very long time and there is no guarantee that they would be able to put it back in service any time soon. Even if they do, the Municipality has no back

up bulldozer for the dumpsite operations. Hence, the Mission owned bulldozer becomes default back up. This seriously exposes the Mission financially in addition to cascading health hazard in its Camps as garbage would continue to pile up.

3. Another critical concern of the continued use of the dumpsite is the health hazard it is exposing to the neighbouring population of the dumpsite. Recently, following complaints by the local population living in the vicinity of the dumpsite, WHO and MINUSCA conducted a joint assessment of the dumpsite operations on 9 September 2016 and interviewed sampled population from ten families. All the families interviewed confirmed that the dumpsite is indeed a health hazard. Out of the 16 people that fell sick, 81% were children. They indicated that the water at the dumpsite sludge dams were fertile breeding places for mosquitoes while the smell of the dumpsite attracted house flies which are causing them diarrhoea among other diseases. It should be noted that the dumpsite sludge dams have water throughout the year. The Mission should be highly concerned as this could easily culminate in litigation against MINUSCA which should be avoided taking into account lessons learnt from the Haiti case.

4. Therefore, for the Mission to have long term plans for Kolongo as recommended in the report to USG/DFS is ill advised. Please refer to the attached two reports from WHO dated 09/09/2016 and OCSD concerning the Kolongo operations dated 27 September 2016 (**Annex-1**). Both reports clearly indicate that Kolongo cannot be a long term option for the Mission hence the need for it to urgently expedite the acquisition and delivery of the Waste Management Yards equipment as approved in the budget and supported by UNHQ in line with the Mission Environmental plan and as recommended by the UNGSC Environmental Team.

5. I would like also to refer to the email on the subject dated 21 September 2016 from the Mission's Chief Engineer (CE) sent to the UNPD Engineering Support Team Leader, Mr. Bruno Maboja, and Chief Engineer Mr. Scot Hastings, as a rejoinder to the email dated 14 September 2016 from the Mission's Chief Supply Chain Management (CSCM). It also refers to your email of 9 September 2016 on the same subject, sent to Mr. Maboja.

6. For the record, there is no truth in gainsaying that the Mission's waste management was not properly handled or that an executable plan was not in place. Memo dated 13 November 2015 (**Annex-2**) requesting urgent action for waste Management by MINUSCA was submitted to the DMS for approval. The same Mission Waste Management Operational Plan was resubmitted and approved by OIC MSD on 20 January 2016

(**Annex-2**). Following the approval, 2 separate memos (**Annex-3**) dated respectively 23 February and 25 March 2016 requesting for DMS immediate approval of requirements for specific waste management items in line with the Mission Environmental Action Plan for 2015/2016 were submitted to the DMS.

7. As you will notice, for the challenges that were faced and continue to be faced, they are mainly due to delayed MSD approvals and procurement process, and not due to any lack of foresight, planning, quantitative and qualitative data on waste, or improper engineering specifications of the required equipment or infrastructure as intimated.

8. That said, it is everyone's understanding that according to the operating structure of the Mission, environmental concerns are under the office of the DDMS/ Environment Unit; waste management under SD/ Engineering Section; and the purchases of goods, works and services under SCM/ Procurement and Acquisition Planning Sections. Given this understanding, in November 2015, the attached comprehensive Operational Plan on the subject of waste management was prepared through the collaboration of DDMS, Environment Unit, Engineering Section and office of the Chief Service Delivery. The noted operational plan provides the baseline data on wastes (liquid and solid) generated by the Mission, including their specific locations in the POBs and TOBs. It is therefore surprising that another waste management study was prepared and sent to UNHQ by the DMS in September 2016, which is not referencing or even complementing this study. This was the more confounding because the plan on waste management in play at the time was informed by the recommendations in the November 2015 study.

9. According to the November 2015 waste management operational plan (signed by the DDMS on 20 January 2016, **Annex-1**), there were a total of 49 operating Mission sites/locations at the time, in the three regions excluding Bangui, of which 22 had Mission staff population ranging from 165 to 569. In fact, there was no Mission POB or TOB with a population presence of less than 40. It is therefore totally incorrect that the Mission installed or planned to install WWTPs at any site with the population numbers (6, 10, 20, 30 50) as claimed by the CSCM and reported to New York, supported by your cited email. Furthermore, according to the plan, the Mission intended to install no more than 20 WWTPs, and this fact was stated by the Chief Engineer in her email to UNPD, clearly indicating that the Mission had no further need for WWTPs.

10. In light of the above, the cited email on the subject from CSCM to UNPD has no merit in its claim to understand, any better, the Mission's waste management, in particular the specified WWTPs for the Mission, even though he attempted to do so with about 14 misconstrued reasons, likely to have been researched from Google. His arguments are farfetched and could easily be applicable to any piece of technology, such as generators or vehicles in the Mission or even in the country of CAR.

11. The WWTPs planned for the Mission are to treat and recycle the waste water generated by the Mission personnel, in line with UN Environmental Policy for UN Field Missions (Ref: 2009.6 dated June 2009), and Waste Management Policy for UN Field Missions (Ref: 2089 dated 21 September 2015). It should suffice for the Mission to take care of this responsibility without blame gaming New York clashing it against the Mission's Service Delivery Pillar and Engineering Section, both of which are MSD. Besides, if the Mission were to undertake a completely new procurement process for WWTP that's now being considered as more appropriate. I do not see it as prudent to write-off the already acquired WWTP equipment.

12. Lastly, I wish to point out that the environmental issues in CAR are bad enough due to lack of local capacity. Therefore, the least the Mission can do is not to take a cavalier attitude but undertake, with utmost seriousness and urgency, its own responsibilities. I would like to reiterate that the Mission urgently acquires the Waste Management Yards equipment as foreseen in the Mission budget and Environmental Plan approved on 25 January 2016 (**Annex-4**).

CC : SRSG, DDMS/Env. Committee Chair, CE, Environmental Officer



RAPPORT D'EVALUATION DU DEPOT DE DECHETS DE KOLONGO



Vue du site de dépôt des déchets de Kolongo, 09/09/2006

Introduction

En 2010, les autorités de la ville de Bangui ont construit au Quartier Kolongo dans le 6^{ème} arrondissement un site de dépôt secondaire des déchets. Ce site constitue le principal dépôt secondaire de déchets pour les villes de Bangui et Bimbo qui comptent près de 800 000 habitants. Depuis le début du troisième trimestre de l'année 2016, de nombreuses plaintes des usagers et des populations riveraines dudit site ont été enregistrées. Les usagers se plaignent de l'encombrement du site et les riverains de nombreuses nuisances et de la recrudescence de maladies liées à la présence de ce site au sein de leur communauté.

Face à cette situation, une équipe inter-agences composée des personnes ci-dessous s'est rendue au dépôt secondaire des déchets de Kolongo le 09 septembre 2016.

N°	Nom et prénom	Organisation
1	ALAFEI NAMA Janice	Maire de la ville de Bangui
2	BATO Sylvie	Maire de la ville de Bangui
3	FOTSING Richard	Organisation mondiale de la santé
4	WAKAM Jeanne d'Arc	MINUSCA Medical section
5	FARAYI MUTANDIRO	MINUSCA BUREAU CSD
6	GOUENDO T. Aban Gidas	MINUSCA section Environnementale

OBJECTIFS

1. Faire un état des lieux du site
2. Evaluer les effets éventuels du site sur l'état de santé des populations riveraines
3. Formuler des recommandations aux autorités compétentes

ETAT DU SITE DE DEOPT DES DECHETS DE KOLONGO

Le site de dépôt secondaire des déchets du quartier Kolongo est situé dans le 6^{ème} Arrondissement de la ville de Bangui à proximité d'un dépôt pétrolier. Il a une superficie d'environ 2 hectares et a été aménagé avec un système de drainage des eaux d'infiltration à 2 cuves. Les déchets y sont déposés sans aucun système de triage et de manière anarchique. Malgré, les travaux de compactage des déchets réalisés au cours du dernier mois, le site n'a pratiquement plus d'espace pour accueillir les nouveaux déchets. De petites flaques d'eau persistent entre les tas d'ordures et favorisent la prolifération des moustiques. Les mouches abondent également sur les nombreux tas de déchets constitués des matières organiques en décomposition.



Une ruelle de 10 mètre de large sépare la barrière du site des premières habitations qui lui sont riveraines dans ses faces latérales droites et postérieures. Près de 2000 personnes habitent dans un rayon de 500 mètres autour du site.

EVALUATION DES EFFETS DU SITE SUR LA SANTE DES RIVERAINS

Une enquête rapide a été menée dans 10 ménages situés dans un rayon de 100 mètres autour du site, sélectionnés au hasard. Une seule personne était interviewée par ménage et les principales questions posées étaient les suivantes :

1. Depuis quand résidez-vous ici ?
2. Combien êtes-vous dans le ménage ?
3. Y-a-t-il des enfants de moins de 5 ans dans le ménage ? Si oui combien ?
4. Avez-vous constaté un changement dans votre état de santé ou celui des autres membres du ménage depuis que vous résidez ici ?
5. Y-a-t-il un cas de maladie dans le ménage au cours du dernier mois ? Si oui, précisez l'âge du malade et la maladie (ou les symptômes clés)
6. Est-ce que le voisinage du site nuit à votre bien être ? Si oui de quelle manière ?
7. Quelle suggestion faites-vous aux autorités à propos du site ?



Répartition des personnes interviewées en fonction de l'âge et du sexe

Tranches d'âge	Femme	Homme	Total
18-34 ans	1	2	3
35 ans et +	5	2	7
Total	6	4	10

Durée de résidence dans la localité

La durée de résidence autour du site varie de 4 mois à 23 ans et 6 des 10 ménages y sont depuis plus de 4 ans.

Nombre de personnes tombées malades au cours du dernier mois et cause probable de la maladie

Tranches d'âge	Nombre de personnes	Nombre de malades	% de personnes tombées malade
0-4 ans	19	13	68,4%
5 ans et plus	54	3	5,6%
Total	73	16	21,9%

Le tableau ci-dessus représente la tranche d'âge dans les ménagés interrogés.

Dans 10 ménages interrogés : 0-4ans, sur 19 enfants, 13 ont souffert de malaria et diarrhées tout ce dernier mois.

5-ans et plus nous avons enregistré 54 personnes et 3 ont souffert de malaria et de diarrhées ce dernier mois. Le total de personnes nous donne 73 cas avec 16 cas de malades enregistrés ce dernier mois.

Parmi les personnes tombées malade dans les 30 derniers jours, les causes de maladies évoquées par les personnes interviewées sont les suivantes :

- Chez les enfants de moins de 5ans : Paludisme (10 enfants) ; Diarrhée (3 enfants)
- Chez les 5 ans et plus : Paludisme (1 personne), Infection respiratoire aiguë (1 personne), Douleur dentaire (1 personne).

Effets de nuisance du site sur la population riveraine

Toutes les personnes interviewées déclarent que le site a engendré une prolifération des mouches et des moustiques dans les ménages. Elles ne peuvent plus manger sur les terrasses des maisons qui sont en permanence envahies par les mouches en journée et les moustiques dans la soirée. Lorsqu'elles sont à l'intérieur, elles doivent fermer en permanence les portes et fenêtre pour ne pas être envahies par les mouches et moustiques. Les odeurs qui proviennent du site les rendent inconfortable et sont parfois insupportables. La prolifération des mouches et des moustiques ainsi que les odeurs selon les personnes interviewées les exposent aux maladies. Quatre des personnes interviewées ont déclaré « c'est à cause de ce site et des moustiques et mouches qu'il engendre que les enfants souffrent tout le temps de paludisme et de diarrhée, nous souhaitons que les autorités ferment le site et le construisent ailleurs »

Doléances des riverains aux autorités

Sur les 10 personnes interviewées, 8 ont demandé la fermeture et la dépollution du site tandis que 2 ont demandé aux autorités de traiter le site afin de les protéger contre les odeurs et les moustiques.

CONCLUSION ET RECOMMANDATIONS

La mission inter-agences réalisée le 09 septembre 2016 au site de dépôt secondaire des déchets de Kolongo a permis de constater que :

- Les ordures sont mal entreposées et mal gérées ce qui crée des conditions pour la prolifération des mouches et des moustiques
- Le site est trop rapproché des populations
- Le site est à l'origine des odeurs, des mouches et des moustiques qui mettent en mal l'état de santé des populations riveraines (la santé étant aussi un état de bien-être mental) et augmentent le risque des maladies transmises par les vecteurs comme les moustiques et les mouches

Au regard de ces constats, la commission recommande aux autorités compétentes notamment le gouvernement et la mairie de Bangui d'envisager la fermeture et la dépollution du site et d'en construire un autre dans une localité en respect des normes environnementales et de

protection des populations. En attendant la mise en œuvre de cette mesure radicale, une évaluation spécialisée serait réalisée et des actions menées en urgence afin d'assurer une meilleure gestion des déchets et la protection des populations riveraines. **La population avait déjà écrit à la municipalité mais sans réponse et elle Pense que comme UN est en train d'utiliser le même site, leur problème sera résolu et c'est la raison pour laquelle elle a relancé le processus**

Fait à Bangui, le 15/09/2016

LA MINUSCA

UNITED NATIONS United Nations Multidimensional Integrated stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic	 MINUSCA	NATIONS UNIES Mission Multidimensionnelle Intégrée des Nations Unies pour la Stabilisation en République Centrafricaine
--	---	--

UPDATE ON THE WORKS AT KOLONGO DUMPSITE AS AT 27 SEPTEMBER, 2016

1. Background

MINUSCA deployed a bulldozer unit at Kolongo dumpsite on 13th August 2016 to further enhance its waste management practices in line with the UN waste management policies to minimise Mission footprint. The Municipality of Bangui complimented MINUSCA efforts by deploying a Compactor Unit but it should be noted that both pieces of equipment are refuelled by MINUSCA. Effective Monday, 15 August 2016, MINUSCA began dumping its non-hazardous solid waste at Kolongo and stopped using the undesignated site in Boeing Dumpsite.

The dumping of excess liquid waste is continuing at Boeing until Engineering manages to finalise and commission the five Waste Water Treatment Plants currently under construction in M'poko Greenfield.

2. Operational Challenges

The dozer broke down and also the rotation of the operations (Indo Eng Coy) caused a two week disruption to garbage dozing operations. Bangui Municipality immediately halted further dumping of waste at the site because it had filled up once again. This had a ripple effect because garbage started piling up again inside MINUSCA Camps in Bangui. The operation may therefore not be sustainable for lack of back-up equipment since the Municipality dozer is still unserviceable. The UNOE dozer has since been redeployed after successful repairs.



3. Resumption of Bulldozing Operations

On Monday, 19 September, the Indonesian Eng Coy resumed bulldozing the garbage after obtaining their driving permit for the dozer equipment and the Municipality of Bangui also began to allow dumping of new garbage.



4. Community Discontent About the Dumpsite

It should also be noted that there is serious public resistance to the dumping of waste at the site. Surrounding populations complained of malaria and diarrhoea prevalence which they associate with the dumpsite. They say it is exacerbating the breeding of mosquitoes and house flies.



A recent WHO led survey revealed that the Dumpsite was established in 2010 despite that the population in its vicinity had raised their concerns but Police force was used to quell the dissent. Before being turned into a garbage dumpsite, the place used to be a dumping place for disused vehicles. WHO survey report is annexed hereto, for further details.

5. Medium to Long Term Waste Management Plan

- a. The disposal of waste by MINUSCA at the Kolongo dumpsite should remain temporary and should continue to contribute logistical support services for waste management works at the site in the interim.
- b. The Engineering Services Integrated Waste Management Yards contracts proposed for M'poko greenfield, which would incorporate incinerators, shredders and balers for both domestic waste management and Property Disposal Unit should be considered as the medium to long term comprehensive solution.

These would include the Centralised Wastewater Treatment Plants and the works are already underway at the Greenfield site in M'poko. (see pictures hereunder).



6. Observations and Recommendations

- a. The past four weeks of operations at Kolongo have revealed that there is need for much closer supervision to ensure much more organised dumping of garbage by truck drivers. Within just one week of the dozer breakdown, the whole place became inaccessible due to random dumping. Official communication needs to be sent to Bangui Municipality in that regard. Below picture shows how inconsiderate the drivers are in terms of management of the dumping space.



- b. As alluded to above, it is advisable for MINUSCA not to consider Kolongo dumpsite in the Mission's long term Waste Management plans given the small size of the dumpsite and the associated health hazards posed to the surrounding communities. UN is an easier target for litigation !
- c. In the interim though, MINUSCA should look at how it can quickly expedite the repairs of the Municipality dozer so that it can serve as an effective back-up for the UNOE dozer to avoid operational logjam that we experienced for close to two weeks.