

Strengthening the governance of National Parks for the sustainable management of ecosystems in Northern Algeria

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12360
Countries
Algeria
Project Name
Strengthening the governance of National Parks for the sustainable management of ecosystems in Northern Algeria
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
5/27/2026
Review completed by PM
6/15/2026
Program Manager
Tasila Banda
Focal Area
Biodiversity
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
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
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
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
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
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments
05/28/2026 TMB

We note that Gender is woven into the project across all three components at varying degrees of depth, however, a Gender Action Plan is not referenced anywhere in the PIF.

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
The future development of the GAP is now clearly referenced in the PIF, page 9, paragraph 13, where the PIF level gender baseline information is included.
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

05/28/2026 TMB

The proposed M&E budget is equivalent to 6% of the GEF project financing. Typically projects of this size have M&E budgets equal to 5% of GEF project financing. Please revise or provide justification for the higher budget request.

06/15/2026 TMB

Though the Agency said that the M&E budget was reduced to 5%, actually it was only reduced to 5.5% of the subtotal - perhaps the Agency missed that per Guidelines, the calculation must be made based on the subtotal - please amend.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)					
M&E	Technical Assistance	The project's M&E plan is designed and implemented to measure the impact of the interventions and identify best practices (include gender disaggregated data where applicable and ensure integration of relevant GAP aspects)	Mid-term, terminal evaluation, as well as additional reports disseminated	GET	88,824.00
Sub Total (\$)					1,615,083.00
					10,700,000.00

Agency's Comments

Thank you, the M&E allocation is now reduced to exactly 5 %.

16 June: Thank you and apologies for the miscalculation. M&E budget is now at 5%, the 'excess' funds have been shifted to C1. Changes highlighted in green.

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

05/28/2026 TMB

The PIF identifies anthropogenic pressures (uncontrolled tourism, wildfires, overgrazing, agricultural encroachment) and climate change as the principal threats to the three National Parks. However, the systemic linkages between these drivers and their root causes (governance gaps, policy weaknesses, lack of sustainable livelihoods) could be articulated more explicitly, within the expected 3-5 pages maximum. This will help the project to move beyond mere stating of symptoms to address underlying system failures, thereby having the rationale which benefits from a more explicit framing of why the current system produces these outcomes and what structural change the project is catalyzing.

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

The barriers to sustainable park management ? as identified during the PIF design ? to be lifted by the project (governance gaps, policy weaknesses, lack of sustainable livelihoods) aim to address the anthropogenic and climate change related problems.

As for example, under output 1.4 (guidance notes) the project will produce knowledge on best solutions for addressing problems such as wildfires ? driven by CC ? and other natural resource management challenges. The produced guidance will be integrated in the proposed policy revision (output 1.1) and will inform the new governance frameworks (1.3).

Outdated policy documents and inadequate involvement of communities in decision making and park management are major contributing factors to the current problems of overgrazing and wildfire issues. The proposed project will address these problems through the participatory management approach to be established under this project.

Please find additional clarifications added to paragraph 19 (without the project scenario, highlighted in yellow)

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

05/28/2026 TMB

1. There is no explicit indication why this project approach has been selected. There is no comparative analysis of other approaches, for instance, whether a purely enforcement-based approach, or a payment-for-ecosystem-services-only model, or a different geographic focus were considered and discarded for known reasons. The rationale is largely self-referential, meaning that the chosen project approach is justified by describing its own features, not by contrasting it with credible alternatives. This will need to be made more explicit at CEO Endorsement.

2. We request the Agency to clarify how the project will ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers. For example, what happens if wildfire frequency doubles, or if community livelihood micro-projects fail due to drought, or if the governance reforms are not sustained after project

closure? The adaptive management framework is not described. This is particularly relevant for a biodiversity project in a semi-arid, climate-exposed region. We request the Agency to address this

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

1. Thank you, we will revise the narrative and provide a comparative analysis during the PPG stage and prior to CEO endorsement.

2. As for example, the management of wildfires will be supported through improved knowledge on forest fire management (see output 1.4), which will be integrated into the policy revisions (1.1) and the community co-management governance frameworks (1.3). By supporting improved forest fire prevention and monitoring (through co-finance project by DGF, see PIF details please) fire risk will be reduced, independent of whether potential fires could double.

The community livelihood micro-projects to be receiving support through the project will be selected based on their sustainability and climate resilience (see Section B paragraph 30), including the resilience to dry conditions, erratic precipitation and warmer temperatures. A list of indicators for project selection will be produced during PPG phase.

The adaptive management framework, as proposed and implemented through this project, will be maintained by DGF after the project ends (see corresponding assumption added in the ToC).

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Would the Agency consider inclusion of additional Key Assumptions, e.g. that national park staff will sustain new governance models after project closure, or that private sector actors will respond to PES mechanisms? These are not explicitly stated/included in the Theory of Change.

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Thank you, an additional assumption was now included in the ToC diagram (Figure 2) under Causal Pathway 1: 'national parks sustain new governance models after project closure?' under Causal Pathway 1'. Regarding private sector involvement, the assumption was moved from Causal Pathway 1 to Causal Pathway 2, and the wording was clarified: 'private companies are interested in PES and CSR mechanisms for park management?.'

Please see section B, paragraphs 14 & 15, yellow highlights. These assumptions will be further tested/ expanded and confirmed during the PPG phase.

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

05/28/2026 TMB

1. We request the Agency to provide high resolution table of complementary projects for the portal version of the PIF.

2. Institutional arrangements: Consistent with the CEO's letter to Agencies on 19 March 2026, please confirm in this section that FAO as GEF Agency will have a voice, but no voting power, in decisions made by the PSC.

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

1. The table has now been replaced with a high-resolution version.

2. We confirm that FAO has no voting power, this is now also clarified in the PIF.

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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
05/28/2026 TMB

Please resubmit the LOE with the standard footnote relating to the capacity assessment of the planned Executing Partner, which is currently missing.

06/12/2026 TMB

An email coming from the OFP accepting the footnote will suffice and quicker given the upcoming June 17 deadline.

06/15/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments Thank you for pointing this out. The complete LoE will be shared shortly.

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 Comments

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

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

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

05/28/2026 TMB

a. Please clarify how the project had consultations with the Amazigh communities around the project areas on project concept, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project concept.

b. Please provide further background information and assessment of 1) history of creating the National Parks and 2) identify historical and ongoing tensions and conflicts, and 3) assessment of enforcement agencies, and 4) social assessment to identify existing users of the National Parks, particularly related to relationship with the Amazigh communities and other local communities around the national parks during the PPG.

- c. Please ensure respecting priorities, governance mechanisms and traditional and local knowledge of the Amazigh communities and local communities in the project design based on thorough consultations with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in and around the National Parks during the PPG phase.
- d. Please consider the Amazigh communities and local communities as a part of governance mechanism of the project throughout the project implementation, especially on Component 1 and 2.
- e. Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to a) integration of traditional and local governance, and traditional and local knowledge, b) capacity building for local communities in the project, c) socio-economic benefits for local communities, particularly vulnerable groups during the PPG.

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

- a. Most park community members consulted during the focus group discussions belong to the Amazigh community (pls see information added to the stakeholder consultation section in the PIF) - the result of these consultations was that these parks have been lacking i.a. participatory management processes, which contributes to the problems affecting national parks not being appropriately addressed (as detailed in the PIF).
- b. Well noted, this will be addressed during the PPG stage.
- c. Well noted, these will certainly be respected during PPG phase and for final project design.
- d. They will be invited to actively participate in the governance mechanism, and general activities to be executed under this project. Kindly note that most project stakeholders in the parks are Amazigh members.
- e. Thank you, we will address this during the PPG stage.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

05/28/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
05/28/2026 TMB

We request the Agency to include the Taxonomy table in the PIF.

06/12/2026 TMB

Cleared.

Agency's Comments Thank you, this is now included.

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 Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments
06/09/2026 TMB

- a. Please ensure that the findings from the gender analysis informs the preparation of the Gender Action Plan and that key elements of the GAP are reflected in the project components.
- b. Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting.
- c. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.).
- d. Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

06/12/2026 TMB

1. Please provide further background information and assessment of 1) history of creating the National Parks and 2) identify historical and ongoing tensions and conflicts, and 3) assessment of enforcement agencies, and 4) social assessment to identify existing users of the National Parks, particularly related to relationship with the the Amazigh communities and other local communities around the national parks during the PPG.

2. Please ensure respecting priorities, governance mechanisms and traditional and local knowledge of the Amazigh communities and local communities in the project design based on thorough consultations with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in and around the National Parks during the PPG phase.

3. Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to a) integration of traditional and local governance, and traditional and local knowledge, b) capacity building for local communities in the project, c) socio-economic benefits for local communities, particularly vulnerable groups during the PPG.

Agency's Comments Thank you, well noted.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/28/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/9/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/12/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/16/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		