



# Promoting cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in Algeria

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**  
12359  
**Countries**  
Algeria  
**Project Name**  
Promoting cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in Algeria  
**Agencies**  
UNIDO  
**Date received by PM**  
5/26/2026  
**Review completed by PM**  
  
**Program Manager**  
Remy Ruat  
**Focal Area**  
Multi Focal Area  
**Project Type**  
MSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments  
Cleared

RR (6/16/2026)

Cleared

RR (6/15/2026)

1. and 2. thank you for the revisions. There are some formatting issues in the inserted paragraphs on criteria (titles and text appearing at the same level, bold formatting missing, unclear separation of sentences/punctuation, unclear hierarchy of sections) - could you please review?

3. Please see follow up question in description/TOC section

4. It is OK to keep LD as a complementary co-benefit, but it seems several priority area of investments described in the criteria only fit the LD FA - thank you for considering - in such case this could also be covered through co-financing.

RR (5/26/2026):

Regarding eligibility for BD and CCM

1. We note the criteria provided in the PIF for technologies that the project consider related to biodiversity ((Ecosystem pressure reduction with restoration outcomes; Geographic linkage to biodiversity-sensitive areas with measurable ecosystem service improvements; Quantifiable biodiversity and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) contributions); Geographic linkage to biodiversity-sensitive areas with measurable ecosystem service improvements; Quantifiable biodiversity and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) contributions).

However, there seems to be confusion between pressure reduction and restoration and between ecosystem services and biodiversity. While ecosystem services are important, they are generally of local importance when the biodiversity focal area is to generate benefits for biodiversity of global significance.

Please revise the criteria or explain how the proposed criteria relate to the state and/or trend of biodiversity of global significance:

(i) Demonstrable ecosystem pressure reduction linked to the main driver of biodiversity loss in the targeted landscape, or demonstrable improvement in the state of ecosystems or biodiversity. (A GEF intervention related to pressure reduction will create benefits only if the pressure to be reduced is the main driver of biodiversity loss in the targeted context. Otherwise, pressure reduction will be overridden.)

(ii) Geographic linkage to areas hosting biodiversity of global significance

(iii) Quantifiable biodiversity and Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) contributions

2. Indicators:

2a- Many of the indicators mentioned relate more to ecosystem services than the state or trend of biodiversity at large (improvement in soil organic carbon; improved water availability or infiltration rates; and productivity improvements). While these can be included and would be LD-relevant, please make sure that indicators capturing ecosystem or biodiversity state or trend are included in the criteria; i.e. cannot be substituted by ecosystem service indicators.

During PPG, please:

- identify the landscape where cleantech solutions are to be deployed, identify the drivers of biodiversity loss in these landscapes (you may wish to look into to the many existing biodiversity focal area projects funded by the GEF in Algeria for reference as needed on how these landscapes assessments are done) and justify in the CEO endorsement request that a significant share of the selected cleantech solutions will contribute to addressing these drivers. This may include refining the selection criteria and should include illustrative examples of technologies that would demonstrably be able to do so.

- develop a results framework with clear biodiversity indicators to underpin the surface area reported under core indicator 4.
- Ensure biodiversity experts are associated in the project development, including drivers and threat assessment, and definition of impact indicators.

3. An exhaustive and exclusive list of types of technologies to be supported by this project should be provided at PIF stage to clarify eligibility for the CCM angle, like past GCIP-related interventions supported by the GEF.

4. Given how heavily the project refers to LDN related intervention, proponents may wish to consider changing the programming to also include the Land Degradation Focal Area. Otherwise, to keep the BD and/or CCM programming, please address eligibility concerns above in point 1/2 and 3 respectively.

### Agency's Comments

UNIDO Response (16/06/2026)

1 and 2. The formatting issues have been resolved across the portal.

3. Project description/TOC section has addressed the comments and clarification on resource and material efficiency and provided its linkage to defined value chain.

4. The interventions will mainly support CCM and BD through GEF financing and the LDN is viewed as a complementary co-benefit. This has been further clarified in the eligible technology category and pathway. Reference to water technologies such as precision irrigation have been removed.

1. Thank you for the comment. The biodiversity technology eligibility criteria have been revised to align with GEF BD focal area requirements. The criteria now require: (i) demonstrable reduction of the principal drivers of biodiversity loss or measurable improvement in biodiversity condition; (ii) geographic linkage to areas hosting biodiversity of global significance; and (iii) quantifiable biodiversity outcomes, with LDN contributions treated as complementary co-benefits. The accompanying text has also been revised to clarify the linkage between technology deployment, reduction of biodiversity threats, and measurable improvements in the state and/or trend of biodiversity.

2. Thank you for the comment. The PIF has been revised to strengthen biodiversity monitoring and eligibility criteria by introducing biodiversity state and trend indicators as primary indicators, while retaining ecosystem service and LDN indicators as complementary co-benefits. The PPG activities have also been expanded to include landscape-level biodiversity and threat assessments, development of a biodiversity results framework aligned with GEF Core Indicator 4, and engagement of biodiversity experts in project preparation.

3. The PIF has been revised to include an exhaustive and exclusive list of eligible technology categories consistent with the CCM focal area. Technologies outside the specified categories will not be eligible for project support. The revised text also clarifies that all supported technologies must demonstrate measurable climate change mitigation benefits through GHG emission reductions, improved energy efficiency, renewable energy deployment, resource efficiency, or other verifiable mitigation outcomes.

4. The PIF has been revised to clarify that biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation remain the primary focal area objectives. References to LDN have been repositioned throughout the document to reflect LDN as a complementary co-benefit rather than a primary objective.

## 2. Project Summary

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

### Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/15/2026):

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Please see follow up comments and keep updated as needed

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Please revise project summary in light of revisions to project design (in particular as it relates to relevance in terms of biodiversity)
2. The problem statement would benefit from being consolidated at the beginning of the summary, instead of half in the first paragraph and half in the second.
3. The summary refers to a "GCIP methodology" but this acronym is not introduced. But besides this, the entire sentence could be removed as it is redundant with the objective statement. It could be usefully replaced by a summary of the project components.
4. For summary of GEBs, please see question #1 above - this will require revisions.

### Agency's Comments

1. The summary has been revised to strengthen its alignment with the updated project design and to clearly articulate CCM and biodiversity relevance with LDN as co-benefits/complementarity. It clarifies how project interventions (cleantech innovation, MSME support, and ecosystem strengthening) directly address drivers of climate change and biodiversity loss.
2. The problem statement has been consolidated in the project summary. It outlines climate, biodiversity, environmental concerns, persistent systemic barriers to scaling climate mitigation technologies in Algeria, including constrained access to finance, limited commercialization capacity, and weak linkages to investors, markets, and enabling policy frameworks.
3. The Project Summary no longer references the GCIP methodology by name. Instead, it describes the three project components around which the project is structured.
4. Noted. GEB has been revised accordingly.

### 3 Indicative Project Overview

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**  
**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

#### Secretariat's Comments Cleared

RR (6/15/2026)

1. Cleared
2. see comments in summary and description - cleared here
3. Noted that 3.1.1 is now titled "Knowledge management, communications, and advocacy strategies are developed and adapted by the PMU". Looking forward to clarifications at CEO ER stage on what this entails - seems to be to facilitate connection with broader GCIP platform activities, which has potential for programmatic impact.

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Project objective is concise and clear - please consider comments made on project scope and revise as needed (this is in reference to the biodiversity scope of the project, depending on responses provided to comments on this).
2. Please see above comments on the biodiversity relevance of this project and its activities and reflect in the project logical framework as needed. Currently the components, outcomes and outputs do not appear sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve project objective and core indicators as they relate to biodiversity and sustainable land management. Please also see more detailed comments in the project description on this regard.
3. output 3.1.1 Internal guidelines are adapted by the PMU currently corresponds to activities that should be covered by Agency Fee and not eligible for project financing. Could you please clarify/revise.

#### Agency's Comments UNIDO Response (16/06/2026)

2. Comment in the summary and description section have been clarified.
3. Noted. Thank you. This shall be further elaborated under 3.1.1 during the PPG phase.
1. Project objective has been slightly refined to clarify the biodiversity scope.
2. The revision to relevant sections have been made to strengthen the biodiversity relevance within the project logical framework. While CCM and BD remain the project's primary focal areas and intended global environmental benefits, the results framework has been revised to reflect biodiversity outcomes across the project components, outcomes, and outputs. The project promotes the commercialization and deployment of biodiversity-positive cleantech solutions that address the driver of biodiversity loss and reduce key pressures on ecosystems.

Biodiversity considerations have been integrated into the accelerator methodology, innovation challenge design, ecosystem-strengthening activities, policy recommendations, and impact measurement framework. The project recognizes that some supported innovations, may also generate complementary/co-benefits for sustainable land management and land degradation neutrality objectives.

3. Regarding Output 3.1.1 has been removed from the results framework.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

gender mainstreamed in components following previous comments on project ID 12102

Agency's Comments

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/15/2026)

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (5/26/2026)

PMC at 5%

1. Output 1.2.5 is categorized as investment but in reality it is a technical assistance facility - it should be recategorized as technical assistance.

2. Output 1.1.4, the only investment-based part of this project, represents only 5% of project budget, which is small. Please clarify and revise as relevant.

Agency's Comments

1. Thank you. Output 1.2.5 has been recategorized as technical assistance.

2. Output 1.1.4 was designed as a blended technical assistance and investment output, following the earlier GEFSEC review and feedback to separate the investment portion for classification purposes. While the isolated investment line appears small (around 5% of the total budget), it represents only the final grant-making step of a much larger acceleration programme. The full allocation for this output is USD 612,715, the majority of which covers the technical assistance components of the three accelerator cycles including application management, screening and selection, tailored business development support, mentorship, impact-measurement assistance, and financial/business-model strengthening. The investment portion is intentionally targeted and catalytic at the end of each cycle, top-performing SMEs participate in a pitching process, and the highest-impact enterprises receive direct grant support. This structure reflects the early-stage nature of the SMEs and the GEF's role in de-risking innovation rather than providing large-scale capital. The current budget distribution with investment grants are designed to complement not replace the substantial TA required to prepare SMEs for deployment of solutions.

#### 4 Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

##### 4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/15/2026):

1. This will have to be addressed during PPG : During PPG, please in the rationale:

- identify the landscape where cleantech solutions are to be deployed, identify the drivers of biodiversity loss in these landscapes (you may wish to look into the many existing biodiversity focal area projects funded by the GEF in Algeria for reference as needed on how these landscapes assessments are done)
- Ensure biodiversity experts are associated in the project development, including drivers and threat assessment, and definition of impact indicators.
- use this as a basis for description of selection criteria in project description/TOC section.

2. see follow up comments in TOC section

3. Cleared

4. Cleared

RR (5/26/2026)

1. At this point the rationale provided on biodiversity is not aligned with eligibility criteria. Please see comments 1 and 2 in section 1 above, and revise rationale accordingly

2. Some paragraphs seem to have been added to the rationale (highlighted in yellow, starting with " While more than 90% of Algeria's electricity (...) " until "(...) strengthened local livelihoods and job creation in renewable energy value chains" which are actually describing the project's approach. These paragraphs should be moved to the project description section

and consolidated under the description of the project's theory of change. Edits to their contents might also be warranted in light of comments above.

3. Similarly, a paragraph was added on co-financing in the rationale (from "The current co-financing envisaged" to "existing UNIDO platforms and tools") which should be moved to the description text box available under the co-financing section.

4. The description of enablers is a bit confusing. It is unclear whether this is a description of a desired outcome, and in such case this is rather a list that should be included under the theory of change description as some of the levers of transformation that the project will pursue, or if these are patterns already being observed - and in such case we would need examples (like what was usefully done for the barriers). It seems that we are in the first case, but grateful for a clarification.

#### Agency's Comments

1. The rationale on biodiversity has been revised and aligned.
2. The mentioned paragraphs have been moved to project description section after introducing the theory of change. The edits to the para have been introduced to reflect the CCM and BD scope.
3. The comment is noted and the paragraph has been moved to indicative co-financing table.
4. The description of enablers refers to desired outcomes and levers of transformation that the project aims to activate, rather than patterns already observed in the Algerian context. The description of enablers now is included under the **ToC** section.

#### 4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

RR (6/15/2026)

**cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

Please see comments 1 and 2 in section 1 above

Agency's Comments1. Based on the comments in section 1, the text where relevant have been revised and updated.

#### 5 B. Project Description

##### 5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/16/2026)

1. Cleared

2. Cleared

RR (6/15/2026):

Noting the biodiversity related criteria added in introduction to the TOC - at CEO ER stage, these should be woven into the detailed description of the components, outcomes, outputs. below follow up comments relate to remaining inconsistencies with an implication on eligibility.

1. The following paragraph still includes a framing on biodiversity which is not aligned with biodiversity focal area criteria and with the revisions included in that regard. It still identifies impact on biodiversity as a indirect impact of emission reductions, which is far to indirect to be relevant in this case. This should be removed, and references to biodiversity anchored in the direct effect that selected cleantech will have if they follow the driver-focused, geographically constrained, selection criteria.

*"The project's results chain is based on the premise that cleantech innovation contributes to climate change mitigation and addresses drivers of biodiversity loss primarily through the reduction of key anthropogenic emissions on environment and ecosystems, including pollution, unsustainable resource use, and inefficiencies in energy, water, and production systems. By supporting the commercialization and deployment of such solutions through MSMEs, the project generates mitigation and biodiversity benefits indirectly but at scale. Contributions to sustainable land management and land degradation neutrality are treated as complementary co-benefits of specific interventions, where relevant."*

This is also visible in the following paragraph, where *"reduces ecosystem pressure"* should be replaced by something in the order of *"supports Algeria's climate and biodiversity priorities"* - as the 4 pillars do not all relate to ecosystems (most of them are purely climate change mitigation and and energy related)

*"While more than 90% of Algeria's electricity is currently generated from natural gas, a gradual transition toward cleantech solutions reduces ecosystem pressure through four pathways: 1) decarbonized energy and resource efficiency systems through cleantech innovations that reduce GHG emissions and improve efficiency in energy and material use across industrial, commercial, and service sectors. The interventions (...)"*

- there is a also in this paragraph a typo that you may wish to review in the description of the fourth transformation pathway - it seems like the intention was to make a reference to modal shift?

2. The wording on resource and material efficiency and on circular economy measures still contains room for confusion.

- material and resource efficiency mostly relates to building and industrial sectors with clear supply chains identified in the programming directions (e.g. cement, steel) - thank you for clarifying.

- waste management overall is not eligible, not just infrastructure - while the reference to this is included in the introduction under the TOC, it is not in the dedicated paragraph on ineligible technologies - could you please confirm?. Currently there is a lot of language throughout the PIF which allude to waste management through resource and material efficiency and circularity, hence the clarification request.

- In addition, biodigesters for example would not be expected to be supported in this case, unless land degradation focal area is included in the programmed objectives.

- the same applies for "water efficient use technologies for productive sectors, precision irrigation, smart water monitoring and leak detection systems" which correspond to Land degradation focal area criteria, not BD and CCM (see initial comment, this relates to water management). same for "precision agriculture, digital agricultural monitoring" (which per se is unclear). NBS supported in the agricultural sector are clearly described in the CCM and BD sections of the GEF-8 programming directions - for CCM for example, this should prioritize cost-effective interventions with high mitigation potential, including improved soil carbon, improved nutrient use and manure management towards sustainable and resilient agricultural systems, and improved livestock management systems - water-efficiency interventions are rather covered by LD focal area or by LDCF/SCCF interventions on climate adaptation ; while for BD, it is related to the criteria setting outlined above.

- there are references to resource efficiency criteria of the GEF in connection with indicators and GEBs - there are no such criteria in the GEF-8 results measurement framework, could you please revise as this could generate confusion - only core indicators of relevance for GEF CCM are GHG emission reductions, renewable energy capacity, and energy savings. Proponents are of course free to include project specific results on top of these core indicators.

3. Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

Clarifications have been provided on project theory of change pathways description and just energy transition related elements - no further comments on these aspects. Please see below remaining comments:

1. Please see comments in introduction about biodiversity scope of this project and reflect corresponding revisions throughout the project description based on direction taken in response.

2. Please clarify an explicit, exhaustive and exclusive list of technologies to be supported on the CCM side, not just the GEF-8 programming objectives, which is too broad. GEFSEC needs to review the list of technologies to ensure alignment with GEF-8 CCM programming objectives, such review cannot be delegated.

It should also be clear in project document that waste management, water management, waste to energy and fossil fuel related activities will not be included. Several references are made to circular economy and material recovery, so this would benefit from clarification.

> As a complement, for full clarity, using GHG emission calculations and biodiversity screening will not be sufficient to address the above -thank you for sharing a list of eligible investments.

3. As this project is not part of the GEF-funded GCIP program from GEF-7, could you please remove all references describing this project as a GCIP project. references clarifying that this project will be aligned with GCIP theory of change and coordinated with GCIP program are fine, but please remove GCIP from the titles (including logframe) to avoid confusion.

#### Agency's Comments

UNIDO Response (16/06/2026)

1. The para after the TOC diagram has been revised. The project's results chain is based on the premise that cleantech innovation contributes to climate change mitigation and directly addresses specific drivers of biodiversity loss through targeted, sector-specific solutions deployed in clearly defined landscapes. The subsequent para that previously contained "reduces ecosystem pressure" has been removed and replaced with supports Algeria's climate and biodiversity priorities. The typo error with modal shift has been fixed.

2. Clarification has been made for resource and material efficiency. Resource efficiency and low-carbon production technologies, including material efficiency interventions limited to industrial and building sectors focusing on clearly defined value chains such as cement, steel, construction materials, and manufacturing processes. Supported technologies will include process optimization, energy- and material-efficiency improvements, and product design solutions that reduce raw material consumption and deliver GHG emission reductions. Additional clarification has been included that technologies outside these categories will not be eligible for financial support under the project in particular fossil fuel extraction, fossil fuel power generation, coal, oil or gas based technologies, waste management technologies including waste to energy, waste treatment or recycling systems, and water supply infrastructure. The text references to "water efficient use technologies for productive sectors, precision irrigation, smart water monitoring etc" have been and resource efficiency criteria in the context of GEF have been removed.

1. The Project description section has been revised to clarify the scope of biodiversity.

2. Addressed. An explicit list of eligible clean technologies has been incorporated into the project description, together with a corresponding list of excluded activities. It clarifies that fossil fuel-related activities, waste management infrastructure, waste-to-energy technologies, and municipal water management infrastructure are not eligible for project support. References to circular economy have also been refined to specify that support is limited to resource and material efficiency. Furthermore, it is clarified that the GHG emission calculations and biodiversity screening will be applied only to eligible technologies to quantify environmental benefits and ensure compliance, rather than to determine investment eligibility.

3. The comment is noted. The text references to broader coordination with GEF-7 GCIP programme and utilization of existing materials and tools have been retained and other references to GCIP has been removed throughout the PIF.

#### 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments Please see comments above in 4.1, 4.2 and 5.1.

Agency's Comments 1. The additionality section has been strengthened based on the previous comment in 4.1, 4.2 and 5.1 by clarify the CCM and BD scope, describing the baseline, explaining the catalytic role of GEF financing, and demonstrating the additional global environmental benefits generated beyond the business-as-usual scenario.

### 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (6/15/2026)

1. Noting some of this language still in the risks section - this can be clarified at CEO ER stage

2. Cleared

3. Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. In the institutional arrangement section, it is noted that the GEF Agency (UNIDO) will not play any execution role and that the project will be fully nationally executed. This is however contradictory with the description provided just below, which rather corresponds word for word to the description of agency self-execution and execution covered in GEF policy:

*"The execution modality of the project will be further assessed and determined during the PPG phase, based on consultations and an institutional capacity assessment of the proposed national executing entity. The assessment will identify the level and type of **support required to ensure that, over the course of the project, the national executing entity is fully equipped to apply the Cleantech Algeria approach and methodology.** Efforts will be made to ensure full national execution, while drawing on international best practices and expertise as needed to ensure quality delivery and long-term sustainability.*

***The distribution of and responsibilities between UNIDO and the national executing entity will be with the objectives of maximizing efficiency of project implementation and execution, and at the same time ensuring capacity building of the national executing entity. The guidelines and resources mentioned under outcome 3.1 will be key in these efforts, including the sustainability and exit strategy."***

Could you please clarify?

Also, as noted above, the content of 3.1 corresponds to ineligible activities and should be covered by Agency fee - these are not eligible for covering by GEF financing.

2. Institutional arrangements: Please ensure that a full narrative description of the institutional arrangements are included, with clear description of the roles of key bodies (GEF Agency, Executing Partner(s), PSC, PMU).

3. Recalling the CEO's letter to GEF Agency Coordinators of 19 March 2026, please ensure that the GEF Agency serves on the PSC as a vocal participant but without a voting right.

#### Agency's Comments

1. The text has been revised to clarify that the project will follow a national execution modality, with the NCPC as proposed execution entity. UNIDO will act solely as the GEF Implementing Agency, providing oversight, technical guidance, and compliance support, without undertaking execution functions. The previous language that could be interpreted as agency execution has been removed. References to Output 3.1.1 has been removed.

2. A full and detailed description of institutional arrangements has been included, clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of the GEF Agency, Executing Partner, Project Steering Committee, and Project Management Unit.

3. The institutional arrangements have been revised to clarify that UNIDO will participate in the Project Steering Committee as a non-voting member.

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/16/2026)

3. Noted; currently this is still a top-down approach, and does not fully align with guidelines. At CEO ER we will expect an excel calculation sheet to be shared for review reflecting the assumptions taken, their consistency with project activities, and the detail of calculations associating the specific emission factors to activity data, clarifying expected investment lifetimes depending on the technologies, and the weights/distribution applied in the mix of technologies and practices supported by the investments; for AFOLU sector investments, the use of a GEF aligned methodology would be required (this could be EXACT or NEXT - and in such case, the excel sheet for that part should also be uploaded to the project documentation).

4. cleared

RR (6/15/2026)

0. Noted

1. Noted

2. Cleared

3. *"the activity assumptions are made as follows per enterprise renewable energy 1,500?3,000 MWh avoided over project lifetime, energy efficiency of 1,000?2,000 MWh saved, e-mobility solutions contributing to emission reduction of 300?600 tCO?e and agritech/water with the estimation of 200?800 tCO?e avoided. Based on 30?40 enterprises with direct mitigation*

*potential, the weighted average mitigation is estimated to 3,000?5,500 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per enterprise with overall total direct GHG reductions amounting to 108,000?216,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e over the project lifetime."*

> Please clarify the source and rationale behind these activity assumptions, and provide some corrections. For renewables for example, reference is made to energy avoided over project lifetime, which does not make any sense - this is a ghg emission reductions calculation, so we would expect to see the emission factor of the renewable energy mix to be supported (which should be clarified), as opposed to that of the alternative (either the grid, or an off-grid alternative). For energy efficiency, what are the sampled measures/technologies underpinning 2,000 MWh of energy saved (also, saved compared to what)? For AFOLU sector interventions, what are the practices represented - is this aligned with the hectares assumptions made in core indicator 4?

Currently these appear to still be top-down empirical emission reductions ratios based on past projects and enterprises supported and are not in line with IPCC accounting principles as emission factors do not correspond to clearly defined activities, but to a mix of interventions on the composition of which we lack information. There are commonly agreed emission factors for specific technologies and practices, available in harmonized databases (for technology sectors - which UNIDO regularly uses for a wide variety of GEF-funded projects in energy and industrial sectors) and tools (see EXACT/NEXT for AFOLU sector) that can be leveraged for that purpose. In addition, a detailed activity specific methodology was expected to be developed under GCIP, which if it exists, could also be mobilized.

> please also clarify the weights used per type of activities.

> perhaps it would be help if agency would submit the excel sheet underpinning the calculation, in line with usual practice.

4. Please see comments in description section regarding eligibility and reflect here, as some references remain to LD-focused interventions (water efficiency) without link to biodiversity or climate change mitigation eligibility. In addition, there remains incorrect/inconsistent sentences which should be removed, as only direct impacts can be reported under core indicator 4 : "The project does not directly finance landscape restoration activities; rather, improvements result from the adoption of climate mitigation technologies that address drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation neutrality co-benefits."

RR (5/26/2026):

0. Across all indicators, the methodology seems to use the total GEB targets and corresponding focal area envelopes as benchmark. Please remove this, for two reasons : (i) such top-down calculations are not aligned with GEF guidelines, they can at best serve as benchmark for internal agency QA/QC purposes, (ii) the numbers used do not reflect the integrated nature of the GEF portfolio for which a significant share of GEBs are achieved through multi-focal area and integrated programmes, with entire projects envelopes being fungible; (iii) calculations should not be based on GEB generation costs at portfolio level adjusted to project envelope, but instead be based on a demonstration of how a given activity supported by the project will lead to the expected quantified impact, associating input data corresponding to these activities with their corresponding parameter.

1. There must have been a series of typos in entering the CI.6. values (respectively 106 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e and 324 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e) - thank you for double checking.

2. The justification provided for indirect emission reductions is quite general - please clarify how these pathways are related to actual project activities/outputs. In addition, an attribution

factor (maximum 20%) should be applied on top of the replication factor to only account for GEF influence, so we would expect a lower number.

3. The methodology used relies on past estimates, which is helpful as a benchmark, but insufficient - just four our common understanding and to avoid any confusion : this is not a bottom-up methodology aligned with GHG accounting principles of associating an emission factor to an activity data, but a top-down empirical estimate based on past projects with a very large scope across a mix of technologies. Please clarify explicitly which technologies will be supported, and on this basis allocate emission factors to the expected share of these technologies in the supported mix, to result in a bottom up estimate. This estimate should be aligned with the entire scope of the project, which is not limited to the CCM funds sourced, but to the entire size of the envelope (2,901,495\$ and joint co-financing). As a reminder, such a bottom-up methodology has been committed to be developed under GCIP in the context of the GCIP global coordination project since GEF-7 across multiple project reviews (since 2021), and we reckon one full cycle later later (and 5+ years) the program has sufficiently progressed since then (given it is nearing completion) to fulfill this UNIDO commitment.

4. For core indicator 4, please see comments in introduction section, and provide corresponding justification for provided value in line with guidelines.

#### Agency's Comments

UNIDO Response (16/06/2026)

3 and 4. Thank you for the detailed comments. . The approach has been revised to ensure alignment with focal area requirements. The methodology has been revised to ensure that all GEF-financed interventions are primarily aligned with CCM through measurable GHG reductions and BD through reduction of key drivers of ecosystem pressure. Interventions related to water efficiency and precision agriculture are no longer treated as standalone objectives. These measures are now included only where they demonstrably reduce GHG emissions (e.g. reduced diesel/electricity use in irrigation systems), and/or address driver of biodiversity loss or reduce the pressure on ecosystems (e.g. reduced nutrient runoff, reduced soil degradation, reduced over-extraction of natural resources). Any LDN benefits are treated explicitly as complementary co-benefits, not as primary drivers of GEF-supported activities. Interventions that primarily correspond to LD focal area objectives without clear climate mitigation or biodiversity benefits will be supported through co-financing only. The section description has been revised as needed and the clarification on emission factor and weights used per activity has been specified. The excel GHG calculation has been uploaded as requested. Kindly note that during the PPG phase, all assumptions will be validated and refined using nationally appropriate emission factors, technology benchmarks, and detailed activity data, and the full calculation model will be further developed and documented in line with GEF requirements.

0. Revised. Top-down benchmarking based on GEF portfolio-level abatement costs has been removed. The methodology has been fully revised to a bottom-up, activity-based approach linking project-supported technologies.

1. Corrected. The values have been reviewed and updated for consistency across the document.

2. Addressed. Indirect emission reductions are now linked to project activities (scaling, investment mobilization, policy uptake). A replication factor of 6 is applied, alongside a conservative 20% attribution factor, resulting in revised indirect emissions of 129,600?259,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

3. Addressed. A bottom-up estimation approach has been adopted specifying technology categories (renewable energy, energy efficiency, e-mobility, agritech/water) based on which the estimates have been derived.

4. Addressed. The estimate for land area under improved practices has been strengthened through an activity-based approach.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

#### **5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

**cleared**

RR (6/16/2026)

Cleared - pending final policy review

RR (6/15/2026):

1. Stakeholder line is empty

2. The context-related risks are currently quite generic and not country or project specific. This could be further detailed by CEO ER stage.

RR (5/26/2026):

1. The risk table should be revised as it is not in line with guidelines. Please, in the column on the right hand side, first describe what risks exist in the specific context of this project and country, and only then, clarify corresponding mitigation measures. For now the column is used to list usual generic risks faced by projects and why they are either not applicable to Algeria or mitigated by some measures. If a risk is not applicable, no need to mention it ; if a mitigation measure is identified, it should respond to a specific risk identified for this project. Thank you for the clarifications/revisions.

2. Also drawing attention of agency on the climate line of the risk table, where a copy-pasting typo inserted itself, describing project execution related matters. Please remove and replace by the appropriate climate risk screening information.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO Response(16/06/2026)

1. Stakeholder category has been filled and completed.
2. The context related risks have been revised and refined further for country specific. Noted. further country or project specific parameters will be detailed out during the PPG.

1 and 2. The risk assessment table has been comprehensively revised in line with GEF guidance. The revised table now focuses on risks that are specific to the project context and operating environment in Algeria, rather than generic project risks. For each risk category, the description has been reformulated to first identify the specific risk that may affect project implementation and achievement of outcomes, followed by corresponding mitigation measures that directly address the identified risk. Risks that were not considered relevant to the project context have been removed. The revised assessment includes project-specific risks related to the biodiversity-positive innovation ecosystem, startup and technology commercialization, stakeholder coordination, access to finance, biodiversity impact measurement, and climate-related challenges. In addition, the climate risk related typo has been addressed.

#### 5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments  
see above

Agency's Comments1. Strengthened and revised the text where relevant on innovation, scaling, and replication

#### 6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments  
**Cleared**

RR (6/15/2026):

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Please see comments in introduction about the biodiversity alignment of this project and revise accordingly based on direction taken.

Agency's Comments1. This section has been revised based on the biodiversity scope clarified in the earlier sections.

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/15/2026):

1. Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Please clarify alignment of project activities with country priorities, strategies and plans in practice (these policies, strategies, plans, are not mentioned - there seems to be available data to draw from in the rationale and description to clarify this).

Agency's Comments  
1. This section has been revised to strengthen the description of the project alignment with Algeria national priorities, strategies and plans. Specific national policy frameworks related to biodiversity conservation, climate action, sustainable development renewable energy, innovation and entrepreneurship have been explicitly reference. It highlights how the project contributes to the implementation of Algeria; NBSAP 2016-2030, NDC, NCP, renewable energy and energy efficiency development programme, Start up Act and entrepreneurship support framework, and other relevant national priorities through the acceleration, financing and scaling of biodiversity positive cleantech innovations.

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/16/2026)

Thank you - this can be revisited as needed during PPG based on further clarity on project scope

RR (6/15/2026):

1. Target 7 and 16 should be removed as the first one is too indirect, and the second one includes ineligible activities that will not be covered by this project.

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Please clarify how project activities will contribute to identified KMGBF targets in practice (this means, a table, with a corresponding description, for each target, of how the project contributes to the identified targets > this information seems to be for now pasted under figure 3 and could be moved and consolidated in the alignment section)

Agency's Comments

UNIDO Response (16/06/2026)

1. Thank you. Target 7 and 16 have been removed from the table and the relevant reference text throughout the portal has been removed.

1. In addition to the brief paragraphs on KMGBF targets mentioned under respective outcomes, a table has been included under the Alignment section as advised that summarizes how project activities contribute to the identified KMGBF targets in practice. The project contributes to the implementation of the KMGBF targets by addressing key drivers of biodiversity loss in Algeria, including land degradation, water stress and over-extraction, pollution, unsustainable production systems and climate change. Through the acceleration and commercialization of biodiversity-positive cleantech solutions, the project supports ecosystem restoration, pollution reduction, integration of biodiversity considerations into business decision-making, sustainable consumption patterns, and strengthened national capacities for biodiversity innovation and technology transfer. These contributions are particularly significant given Algeria's location within the Mediterranean Basin biodiversity hotspot and the priorities identified in Algeria's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2016-2030).

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

##### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

yes

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (5/26/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments

#### **8 Annexes**

##### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

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

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments  
**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

yes

Agency's Comments  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments  
**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

yes

Agency's Comments  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

Yes

Agency's Comments

**8.3 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?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026)

Comments already addressed based on previous project ID - the names of co-financiers and types of support is now clarified.

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (5/26/2026):

Yes

#### Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared - pending final policy review**

RR (6/15/2026):

1. LOE is signed by OFP, funds match, and correspond to the Source of Funds table on the portal.

RR (5/26/2026):

1. The letter is not in line with expected format - this is due to a confusion on how flexibility is applied to programming. The OFP letter of endorsement should only include in the table the focal areas that are used as a Source for the funding.

The paragraph below (regarding intended programming of funds through flexibility) is also not needed. In case you keep it, please ensure that it reflects the final programming of funds. Bringing to the attention of the Agency and country OFP that should the revised LOE include again erroneous references to programmed objectives as reflected in the final project design (which is not expected in the LOE), there is a risk that the LOE would have to be re-issued yet again to reflect final programming (which is still pending confirmation based on how comments in the current project review are being addressed), generating avoidable delays - hence our suggestion to remove this paragraph which is not in line with the agreed template.

"In line with the GEF Policy and Guidelines on the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources, I confirm that full flexibility of STAR resources is being utilized, and that US\$ 1,562,883 and US\$ 1,338,612 (US\$ 2,901,495 in total) sourced from the Land Degradation (LD)focal area will be programmed towards Climate Change (CC) and Biodiversity (BD) focal areas, respectively."

Agency's Comments1. The revised letter has been obtained from the GEF OFP indicating the sources of funds and updated project title. The re-endorsed letter is attached to Portal. The revised letter was obtained after multiple attempts to contact GEF OFP seeking clarity on the programming of funds i.e to keep only CCM or CCM and BD. The previous submission comment had mentioned that we may wish to keep the para related to programming of funds for information. Therefore, the text related to the programming of funds were not modified in the LOE signed by the OFP but only reflected the new title and sources of funds.

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

#### Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

RR (5/26/2026):

Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/16/2026)

Cleared

RR (6/15/2026):

1. Given the strong focus of the project objectives, outputs and activities on LDN related priorities, a Rio marker of 1 for LD should be selected.

RR (5/26/2026)

1. Please see comments in section 1 regarding BD scope of this project and reflect any change in the Rio Marker selection as well based on responses to comments made.

Agency's Comments1. The Rio marker has been changed to 1.

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

**Cleared**

RR (6/15/2026):

To be updated at CEO ER stage

RR (5/26/2026):

1. Please see comments in section 1 regarding BD scope of this project and reflect any change in the taxonomy selection as well based on responses to comments made.

Agency's Comments1. No changes to the taxonomy.

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

RR (6/16/2026)

Project recommended for technical clearance

RR (6/15/2026):

Thank you for addressing remaining comments and resubmitting.

Thank you for removing highlights from the next (hopefully final) iteration, to improve readability. Thank you for also performing a final formatting quality check (please see comments above).

RR (12/1/2025):

1. Thank you for addressing comments above and resubmitting, highlighting changes made in a different color for ease of reference.

Agency's Comments1. Thank you. The revisions have been made and highlighted in blue.  
**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

#### Secretariat's Comments

- This is already addressed in the results framework so the enclosed is just for record keeping for PPG purposes : In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please indicate measures to facilitate and support its implementation (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

- During PPG, please:

- > identify the landscape where cleantech solutions are to be deployed, identify the drivers of biodiversity loss in these landscapes (you may wish to look into the many existing biodiversity focal area projects funded by the GEF in Algeria for reference as needed on how these landscapes assessments are done) and justify in the CEO endorsement request that a significant share of the selected cleantech solutions will contribute to addressing these drivers. This may include refining the selection criteria and should include illustrative examples of technologies that would demonstrably be able to do so.
- > develop a results framework with clear biodiversity indicators to underpin the surface area reported under core indicator 4.
- > Ensure biodiversity experts are associated in the project development, including drivers and threat assessment, and definition of impact indicators.

- on core indicators, an excel calculation sheet to be shared for review reflecting the assumptions taken, their consistency with project activities, and the detail of calculations associating the specific emission factors to activity data, clarifying expected investment lifetimes depending on the technologies, and the weights/distribution applied in the mix of technologies and practices supported by the investments; for AFOLU sector investments, the use of a GEF aligned methodology would be required (this could be EXACT or NEXT - and in such case, the excel sheet for that part should also be uploaded to the project documentation).

- The context-related risks are currently quite generic and not country or project specific. This could be further detailed by CEO ER stage.

Agency's Comments1. Addressed the inclusion of gender specific indicators for results framework, gender action plan, PIR and MTRs

#### Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	<b>5/26/2026</b>	

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/15/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/16/2026</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		