

Integrated forest and biodiversity management for sustainable development in the Biban mountain range

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10170

Countries

Algeria

Project Name

Integrated forest and biodiversity management for sustainable development in the Biban mountain range

Agenices

FAO

Date received by PM

4/7/2019

Review completed by PM

9/6/2019

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

The project is aligned with the BD strategy for GEF-7

The project is developed under LD 1.1 (SLM) and LD 1.4 (integrated approach).

1. The problems in the considered region are well described: fire, overgrazing, encroachment, unsustainable harvesting, logging, climate change. However, we are not seeing how the proposed studies, assessments, awareness, plans, analysis, documents, platform, amendments, guidelines, strategy, and technical assistance -these words reflect ALL the 15 outputs of the project, except those related to Monitoring and Evaluation- are going to address these problems and what BD benefits will be derived from the proposed investments. We are not supporting further development of this project with BD or LD resources.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response

The components and outputs have been reworded to emphasize the expected results and highlight the planned on-the-ground interventions.

The project can be summarised as follows: The Biban mountain range is classified as a KBA because of the importance of its flora and fauna diversity. The large majority of the project budget is therefore directed towards on-the ground interventions to develop sustainable, alternative livelihoods for local communities. This will reduce the pressure on natural resources and enable to conserve natural habitat to support biodiversity. Livelihoods improvement will be done in alignment with land-use planning and zoning exercise to be undertaken at the communal level, therefore covering 32,000 ha.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

General comments:

1. With 99.63% of co-financing from recurrent expenditures, mainly from the government, this project looks as a stand-alone project, with the obligation to finance ALL the activities from baseline studies (output 1.1.1/inventories, 1.1.2/assessment), assessments (outputs 1.1.5, 1.1.7), strategies (outputs 3.1.5), plans (outputs 1.1.4,

2.1.2), awareness (outputs 1.1.3, 3.1.3) to legal documents (1.1.6, 3.1.2) with no interventions on the ground, and no financing and mechanisms for sustainability. We are not seeing a right use of GEF resources to complete a baseline situation, co-financing opportunities, and generate Global Environment Benefits. Please, remind that Algeria is not a LDC, and classified in the list of UMIC/HIC, and we are expecting a different **ambition** in terms of impact and co-financing.

2. Some outputs are difficult to capture, because of the formulation: 1.1.3, 1.1.7, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 3.1.3. If needed, please refer to the OECD glossary on key terms in evaluation and result-based management to adjust the formulation of outputs. The formulation of outputs should reflect the results of activities, be concrete/tangible, and if possible, quantified.

Component 1.

3. It is not clear how the project aims at "creating positive attitudes" and "preferences for BD positive development" with the proposed outputs (i.e. Inventory, assessments, "increase understanding", management plans, gap analysis, and documents).

4. Is it really necessary to use all these financial resources (GEF \$0.5 million + co-financing \$ 2.9 million) in all these planning activities when there is total clarity of the root causes of environmental degradation, including unsustainable harvest of forest and NTFPs, fire, overgrazing, encroachment)?

5. Can you clarify the output 1.1.7? What covers "assessment of the opportunities for the creation of one or several protected areas....and support to initiate the protected area creation process if appropriate".

6. In the text, it is explained that most of co-financing is focused on environmental assessments and studies: it is hard then to accept the use of GEF resources for more studies.

Component 2.

7. If this component is the one to deliver the tangible results on the ground, not sure how is this going to take place with Technical Assistance only (i.e. technical support services, business plans). It is of concern that almost all co-financing is on Recurrent Expenditures and hardly anything on Investment Mobilized (\$99K out of \$26.7 million).

8. What are the activities to deliver output 2.1.3?

9. What is the legitimacy to this GEF project to develop business plans for Micro and SMEs? Please elaborate on the relationship between this activity and the proposed GEBs

10. The target 2 mentions 5,000 inhabitants, but for what kind of activities?

11. It is difficult to capture the value for money of this component 2 (technical assistance, plans) financed at a height of \$1.8 million from GEF resources.

Component 3.

12. How can a mix of a platform, amendments to legal documents, guidelines, and "increased awareness" be enough to change unsustainable practices on the ground, and promote SLM and SFM?

13. What is this "Biban mountain range ND platform" and how are local communities living in isolation (as described in the PIF) going to access it?

14. Should output 3.1.2 be part of Component 1?

15. As in Component 2, not clear how the replication will take place when there is no INV and the proposed activities can be classified as "soft" (increase awareness, guidelines, etc).

16. Sustainability seems a huge issue for all the proposed products.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. A narrow interpretation of mobilized investment was used, not valuing properly the investments the country is making in support of the project objective achievement. The definition was revised, and is coherent with the GEF co-financing policy. The mobilized investment is 7.6 times the GEF investment and equals over USD25,2M.

However, negotiations with project partners will continue through PPG in order to engage partners strongly, and through co-financing arrangements guarantee sustainability of project results.

2. The project outputs were reworded to make them more concrete and measurable. Outputs 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 have now been quantified in the wording of the output.

3. The formulation of Component 1 was amended to "Biodiversity and Land management planning, policy strengthening and financial capacity building for Sustainable Forest and Land Management in the Biban mountain range" to better reflect the results to be achieved.

4. The funds allocated to this component were reduced to USD380,000. The focus will be on addressing the knowledge gaps on biodiversity and ecosystems in the Biban mountain range, land-use planning, zoning (including the potential creation of a new protected area) and regulation to reduce the use of the identified unsustainable practices.

5. Under Output 1.1.7, ecological, institutional and social conditions will be assessed to see whether the creation of a new protected area is feasible. Secondly, relevant partners and stakeholders will be identified for the management of such PA, undertaking the consultation processes, undertaking the initial legal steps towards the creation of the new protected area including drafting and submitting the conventions and agreements.

6. It was clarified under Section 5 that USD84,000 of the cofinancing focuses on environmental assessment and studies. Some studies describing species richness are available for the Biban mountain range (particularly for plant species), however, they are partial and often outdated. The information available is mainly based on observations. Data available will be updated under this output and the gaps will be filled.

7. The name of the output and description of the corresponding interventions was further clarified to emphasize the interventions to be implemented on the ground and to which more than 60% of the project budget is allocated.

The mobilized investment further supporting this component is over USD20M.

8. Small- to medium-scale, community-based, income-generating projects will be developed under Output 2.1.2 and implemented under Output 2.1.3. These projects will be chosen by communities and potentially include agroecology, agritourism, ecotourism, handcrafting, forestry and NTFP value chains. This was clarified in the output title and description.

9. Poverty and the absence of livelihood opportunities is a major driver of environmental degradation in the two targeted communes. The development of sustainable, alternative livelihoods will enable to lift the pressure on natural resources caused by the inadequate management of agricultural, pastoral and forest resources.

10. 5,000 people is the targeted number of people for which significant behavioral changes could be measured as a result of the awareness-raising activities. However, this target was now replaced by a target for the training interventions for government staff. This number will be lower, but confirmed during PPG.

11. It was now clarified in the output name that under Component 2, at least 50 micro-, small- or medium-scale businesses based on the sustainable management of natural resources will be established. The budget was now increased from USD 1,8M to USD2,0M to maximise the budget available for these on-the-ground interventions.

12. Under Component 2 – where the large majority of the project budget and cofinancing is directed – 50 community-based projects will be supported in the targeted communes. These projects will demonstrated the productivity and cost-efficiency of income-generating interventions based on the sustainable use of natural resources. Component 1 will create the enabling conditions for the implementation and sustainability of these projects. Component 3 will promote the upscaling of successful income-generating interventions in other areas of the Biban mountain range and beyond.

13. The description of the platform was further detailed. The platform will bring together community representative, decentralised authorities, walis, NGOs and private sectors across the Biban mountain range. It will enable a more harmonised management of natural resources, knowledge sharing on best practices, and increased awareness and access of local communities to financial resources to replicate best practices.

14. Point well taken, and it was debated beforehand within the project formulation team. This is the reasoning: Under Component 1, the outputs and interventions will be focused on the two targeted communes. The policy strengthening work therefore focuses on local legislative documents. However, Component 3 focuses on the entire Biban mountain range and promotes the upscaling of successful project interventions across this landscape and at the national scale including through policy strengthening. This is the reason why Output 3.1.2 was placed under Component 3.

15. Component 2 is INV and focuses on the development of sustainable income generating activities on the ground. MSME will receive technical support and funding to adopt the income-generating interventions that they will have chosen. The replication of successful interventions across the Biban mountain range and in other mountaneous, forest ecosystems in Algeria will be promoted by the capacity building interventions under Output 1.1.1 and 2.1.1, and awareness raising, policy strengthening and financial capacity building interventions under Component 3. As Algeria is going through a transitional phase, funding opportunities will arise and new development models such as the one supported by the project will be followed.

16. The required institutional and technical capacity will be put in place at government level to enable long-term support to local communities for the maintenance of the income-generating activities newly adopted. This will be done through training, development of supporting policy documents, establishment of a technical support team in the targeted communes and a biodiversity platform at the mountain range scale. On-the-ground interventions under Component 2 will enable to increase the economic value of natural resources, thereby ensuring communities and government will for environmental protection in the Biban mountain range in the long term.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. Most of the co-financing is recurrent costs, leaving hardly any financial resources free for implementation on the activities on the ground that should be directly related to the delivery of GEBs.

2. Algeria is in the list of Upper Middle-Income Countries and High-Income Countries (that are not Least Developed Countries or Small Island Developing States). The new co-financing policy, FI/PL/01, approved on June 26, 2018, is then applicable: as you know there is a level of ambition for the portfolio of projects and programs approved in UMICs and HICs that are not LDCs or SIDS to reach a ratio of Investment Mobilized to GEF financing of at least 5:1. We note the efforts from FAO to bring some co-financing and mobilize investments, but we are far from something acceptable.

8-26-19

The GEF Secretariat is requesting additional information on co-financing including the core resources brought by FAO. The GEF requires reassurance that the co-financing indicated as Investment Mobilization will remain in that category so the project can be run effectively. Changing the category to Technical Assistance will make the execution and sustainability of the project very difficult.

9-6-19

Cleared

ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

Some grant co-financing has been marked as "recurrent expenditures". However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "grant", it should typically be classified as "investment mobilized" rather than "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf). Please address.

-

C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Government	Ministry of Environment and Renewable Energy	Grant	Investment mobilized	11,876,155
Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fisheries (INRF and INRAA)	Grant	Investment mobilized	12,584,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Fisheries (INRF and INRAA)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	1,416,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	Investment mobilized	806,000
Total Project Cost(\$)				26,682,155

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

4 September 2019:

*Please, allow us to clarify how ‘investment mobilised’ was defined before recalling the single contributions by co-financing partners. Investment mobilised comprises all the relevant investments by project partners in the Biban Mountain Range that are not operating or operational costs. Therefore, these are relevant ongoing or planned programmes and projects that deliver national and/or regional (Wilaya level) development plans and strategies (please, see narrative in **Part II, 1a Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects** for details). This definition – which strongly links the investments from the key project executing partners and the GEF Agency to the GEF investment – translates into a partnership that is being created in support of the project objective, in short the sustainable management of the Biban Mountain Range natural resource base benefitting local communities as well as the global environment. It is that partnership that is believed to sustain through time, embed the incremental value of the GEF investment and further catalyse future investments in support of the project objective.*

From the vast array of programmes and projects, only a number have been retained as co-financing. This selection was based on a thorough consultation process led by the Ministry of Environment and Renewable Energy (MEER), and involving multiple stakeholders including various Ministries, their divisions and decentralised services and local Wallis (leader of the target Wilayas). Co-financing amounts have been communicated and confirmed in writing by different co-financiers to the MEER. There is at this moment in time, no reason to doubt the support to the Biban project from the different co-financiers and therefore the partnership of the co-financing institutes in the project execution, and with it the materialisation of these investments as co-financing.

*MEER investment mobilised – USD11,876,155 investment has been confirmed by the Wallis in writing and constitutes a subset of projects from the portfolio of planned and ongoing rural development projects in the target Wilayas (table and details in **Part II, 1a Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects**). These investments include both infrastructure development (road construction, tree plantations, flood protection measures, facilities for awareness-raising activities), as well as support to studies that help fill knowledge gaps upon which the GEF project can further build (see **Part II, 1a Incremental cost reasoning** for per component details). The nature of these investments is not one of technical assistance (with the exception of the few studies).*

*MOA (INRF and INRAA) investment mobilised – USD12,584,000 investment has been confirmed in writing by the MOA and comprises the multi-year projects in support of key NTFP and agricultural development interventions (olive, date, carob primarily). Also here, the investments are not in support of technical assistance to the project, and are not in kind (see **Part II, 1a Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects and Incremental cost reasoning** for more details).*

MOA recurrent investment – In addition to the investment mobilised, USD1,416,000 of MOAs recurrent investments will be supporting the project execution in its day-to-day management via in-kind contributions that include car pools, office space, staff time, etc.

FAO investment mobilised – The USD806,000 co-financing provided by FAO results from a number of projects that implement the Country Programme Framework in Algeria (national priorities for agricultural development). The relevant projects, complementing the GEF investment, are listed in Part II, 1a Baseline Scenario and associated baseline projects. These projects are a subset of the work FAO delivers in the country (selected based on relevance, geography, timing) and are expected to be delivering results during the first phase of the GEF project. For instance, project ALG/3702 support the value chain development of the barbary fig, delivering not only studies of interest to the GEF project on markets, areas and scope for development, but also investing in an innovation and research campus that helps develop production and quality. These investments will be carried out, regardless of the GEF project, and the nature of the work and deliverables have been set.

In sum, co-financing and in particular the investment mobilised by project partners is believed to be solid and realistic. The amounts result from thorough consultations, and therefore a good understanding of the engagement in the project execution and sustainability. This is true for MEER and MOA investments, as well as FAO investments.

June 2019:

1. and 2. have been answered previously. The contributions from partners have been redefined in alignment with the updated co-financing policy of the GEF.

5 Nov 2015:

Additional Comment on IM from the Min. of Agriculture well received and addressed

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Yes. Fees are 9.5%.

Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Algeria has STAR \$9.71 million and the project is using \$3.29 million

Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Algeria has enough in BD and LD in STAR for this project.

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

PPG is \$100,000 and it is within the limits. Agency fee is 9.5%.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. Not clear how (and where) the 32,000 will be delivered. Please check review above.
2. Clarify the definition of direct beneficiaries (19,500 beneficiaries, 50% female).

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. The combined surface of the targeted communes – Ighil Ali and Teniet En Nasr within the Biban mountain range – where the Biodiversity and Land Management Plans will be developed, integrated into the communal development plans, and implemented, is 32,000 ha. Biodiversity and land management will therefore be improved over this surface.

2. Based on the last census (2008), the combined population in the two communes was estimated to be 19,500 people. This is the number of people that will be involved in the participatory development planning exercise under Output 1.1.4. It is also the targeted population for awareness raising and for the development of business plans to adopt sustainable, nature-based income generating activities.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Key-words are tagged.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. Yes. But there is no correspondence between the analysis of the problems, root causes and barriers with the proposed interventions. This a significant issue that calls for the re-structuring of the project to carry out activities that tackle the problems and barriers listed.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. "The main barriers to the sustainable management of land and forest resources in the Biban mountain range and the outputs that will directly address them are listed below:

- limited technical capacity in the country for sustainable agriculture and forest management, which will be addressed under Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 2.1.1
- outdated approaches of decision makers, planners and technical staffs regarding the management of forest and agricultural resources Outputs 1.1.4, 1.1.6 and 1.1.7
- an economic system that greatly undervalues ecosystem goods and services, which will be addressed under Outputs 1.1.5 and 3.1.5
- the limited opportunities for local communities to adopt improved livelihoods based on the sustainable management of natural resources in rural areas, which will be addressed under Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3

- no successful examples of approaches and practices for the sustainable management of biodiversity, forest and land resources are available, which will be addressed under Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

- limited knowledge on the role of biodiversity and natural ecosystems including the diversity of goods and services provided, which will be addressed under Outputs 3.1.3 and 3.2.3

(Please see the Theory of Change of the project and the attached excel file for more information on the correspondence between the barriers and threats to biodiversity and land in the Biban mountain range and the project outputs)."

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

The baseline scenario (the investments that will take place whether or not the GEF project gets approved) are listed for the two targeted Wilayas; \$9.5 million and \$9.8 million.

1. Please retain the projects that relate to the geographies and themes of this project listed on page 23 only ("The ongoing and planned FAO country programme includes the following projects which are complementary to this proposed GEF intervention"). Why these projects are labeled "complementary"? Is there a direct relationship with the GEF project?

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. The list of FAO projects was revised to focus only on the projects that are most aligned with the GEF-funded project. There are now 4 ongoing projects described in the PIF which focus on: olive oil production, development of NTFP micro-enterprises, development of Barbary fig products and water management. The GEF-funded project will complement these projects by building on their experience, and replicate, upscale and/or sustain their successful interventions.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. Yes. But see comments above on the relationship between outputs, outcomes and components and the problems, root causes and barriers.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. The links between the problems, barriers and outputs of the project were clarified in the logframe and throughout the text. A table was prepared to clarify these links, and is attached as a separate document.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. While the project is aligned with the BD strategy (BD-1-1), it is not clear what the actual investments will be in support of BD conservation.

2. There is not enough elements to figure out how the proposed project can deliver SLM benefits under LD1.1 or LD1.4.

8-27-19

Please include a number of ha under SLM (4.3). Please avoid double counting with 4.1 (Indicators)

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

9-3-19

The core indicator 4 has been amended. The target area totals 32,000ha of land, including 16,000ha of biodiversity-rich forest land, 6,000ha of rangeland and 10,000ha of agricultural land. Therefore, improved management of the total area will benefit biodiversity on a total of 16,000ha (indicator 4.1), while the remaining production land benefits from sustainable land management practices positively impacting soil, nutrient recycling, diversity, water and more (16,000ha under indicator 4.3).

June 2019

1. The Biban mountain range is one of the KBAs of the mediterranean region. The biodiversity inventory is not complete but the richness of the flora species identified so far and the scarcity of forested environment in Algeria make it a priority habitat to be conserved in the country. The sustainable income-generating activities to be developed under Component 2, the Integrated forest management (Planting, forest tinning, Pruning, management of forest fodder through management of plots (defense)) and the support to the creation of a new protected area to increase the connectivity with the three neighboring national park Djurdjura, Gouraya and/or Babors will support the conservation of forest habitat thereby supporting biodiversity conservation. In addition, improved knowledge availability and awareness on fauna and flora species, on biodiversity re-partition, ecosystems, threats and levels of degradation in the Biban mountain range, on the social, economic and cultural value of biodiversity, land and ecosystems, will promote biodiversity conservation in the Biban mountain range and beyond.

2. The project will directly contribute to LD 1-1 "Maintain and improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through sustainable land management" by supporting the sustainable management of forest and land resources across 32,000 ha and sustainably improving agricultural productivity and diversity. The development of livelihoods based on the sustainable use of natural resources, awareness raising on the role of biodiversity and ecosystems, and increased food production and income generated by natural ecosystems, will reduce the need for local communities to adopt detrimental practices as a response to reduced agricultural and pastoral productivity thereby contributing to achieving LD1-4 "Reduce pressure on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape". Forest Management activities such as replanting, tinning, pasture defense will increase the resilience in the wider landscape.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. The project appears as a stand-alone project financing all together preparation studies, assessments, plans, awareness activities, etc. It is however difficult to understand how the project addresses the pre-identified problems, and will generate global environment benefits.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. See response above.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. It is not possible to see if the proposed core indicator of 32,000 hectares has BD value, and not clear if they can be delivered with the proposed interventions. Unlikely to be achievable with soft targets only.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. The Biban mountain range is classified as a KBA because of the importance of its flora and fauna diversity. The large majority of the project budget is therefore directed towards on-the ground interventions to develop sustainable, alternative livelihoods for local communities. This will reduce the pressure on natural resources and enable to conserve natural habitat to support biodiversity. Livelihoods improvement will be done in alignment with land-use planning and zoning exercise to be undertaken at the communal level, therefore covering 32,000 ha.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. The proposed text about innovation reads more like a "boilerplate text" than an evaluation on whether the project is innovative or not. The sustainability and replication issues are difficult to envision, when the project itself has serious flaws on the financials to deliver even the proposed core indicators.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. Several aspects of the project are innovative in Algeria. These include: i) the landscape/ecosystem scale approach to natural resources management that considers ecosystem functioning; ii) the collaboration across sectors, sectors and groups of stakeholders for integrated management; and iii) the participatory approach to ensure ownership of the project by local communities. The project will also demonstrate innovations on the ground such as the agroecology approach whose principles are seldom used in Algeria.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Yes. Annex A. Please add a map of Algeria locating the general area of the project. Thanks

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response A map is included.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. If the current GEF project is building on "the consultative and analytical work undertaken through the Project "Sustainable and Integrated Development of the Biban Mountain Range" (TCP/ALG/3501) supported by FAO and the Government of Algeria", are all the stakeholders listed in the table really relevant to this project? Are all "stakeholders listed known or expected to play a role in this project?.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. All stakeholders initially listed in the PIF will be involved in the project at some stage. However, the table was streamlined to focus only on the stakeholders that will play a major role in the implementation of the project.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. What are the likely Private Sector companies "at the national and local levels that will play a major role for the implementation of the interventions under Component 2 for the design and implementation of business plans based on the sustainable use of natural resources? If mentioned they should be known by now.

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. Several companies involved in the production and commercialization of agricultural and NTFP products have been identified so far. They include Enterprise BOUBLENZA (leader in the exportation of carob products), Enterprise SOUMMAN (specialised in livestock products), Enterprise IFRI (specialized in oils). The list of relevant private sector partners will be further developed at PPG phase.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. What CC models were consulted to consider this risk as low?
2. Is the risk associated with the leisure and tourism sector rally low?

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. A study undertaken by FAO-RNE (office for North Africa and Near East) on the impact of CC on farming systems was consulted to assess this risk.

2. The occurrence of this risk is low but its effect would be high. Overall rating was therefore brought up to Medium.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. Are the 4 GEF and non-GEF projects proposed for coordination, making investments in the target areas? Has FAO enter into communication with UNDP regarding the coordination with their projects?

8-27-19

Cleared

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

While at the top of the project it is clear that the the Executing Partner is MEER, in Section 6. Coordination, that is no longer clear. Suggest leaving that role to the Executing Partner only. Please address and resubmit.

Other Executing Partner(s)

Ministry for Environment and Renewable Energy (MEER)

Executing Partner Type

Government

6. Coordination

Outline the institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The MEER and FAO will be directly responsible for coordination. FAO will lead in ensuring coordination with international partners and initiatives, whereas MEER will ensure coordination with national and local partners and national initiatives.

11-5-19

Cleared

1.

Agency Response

1. UNDP has not been consulted yet. This is planned at PPG stage, during which workshops and joint field work is foreseen. It is expected that representatives from relevant UNDP projects will be involved in the PPG phase and implementation phase of the project. Still, to date, the link with all relevant UN sister agencies and GEF agencies has been assured through the executing partner of the project, the MEER.

5 Nov 2019

Text in the body of the PIF revised to clarify the intention of having MEER executing the project.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

1. What is the nature of this "multi-stakeholder Biban mountain range Biodiversity Platform"? is it going to be available to the local communities or is this going to be based in central Government?
2. Where are the funds likely to come to replicate the on-the-ground interventions of Component 2 across the Biban mountain range and how much is the target for fundraising?

8-27-19

Cleared

Agency Response 1. The structure and the purpose of the platform were further defined in the PIF. It will be an intercommunal platform with representatives from local government, private sector, NGOs and local communities with focal points at the wilaya and communal levels.

2. Public funding at the Wilaya level are most likely going to guarantee upscaling of project results.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

Yes. Signed by the OFP on file.

Cleared

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-19-19

No. The GEFSEC does not support any further development of this project as conceived.

8-27-19

No. Please address outstanding issue under item Part I-3 and Part II-4. The GEF is available for consultation.

9-3-16

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

11-5-19

The PIF properly addressed comments from PPO and is now recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The GEF secretariat requests that at CEO Endorsement, the co-financing amount and modality (Investment Mobilized) to remain as close to the PIF ratio as possible to enable the proper executing of activities on the ground. Thanks.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		