



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5808		
Country/Region:	Algeria		
Project Title:	Developing a National Strategy and Legal and Institutional Framework on Access to Genetic Resources and Related Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge in Line with the CBD and Its Nagoya Protocol in Algeria		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5311 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		BD-4;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$60,000	Project Grant:	\$1,940,000
Co-financing:	\$4,180,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,180,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	4-28-14 Yes. Algeria is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	4-28-14 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for April 15th, 2014. The letter is dated April 15th. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	4-28-14 Algeria has a BD balance of \$2.37M,	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		enough for this \$1.9M project. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	4-28-14 Algeria has a BD balance of \$2.37M, enough for this \$1.9M project. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	4-28-14 Yes. BD-4, Aichi Targets (see page 6 of PIF). Cleared	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	5-1-14 Yes. NBSAP 1997, strengthen 2002; 4th National Report; and National Action Plan for the Environment and Sustainable Development (NAPE-SD). Cleared	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	5-1-14 Yes. Please see details on page 5. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>5-1-14</p> <p>The scope of the project is overambitious for the budget available for this project.</p> <p>COMPONENT 1.</p> <p>This component should limit to the elements listed in the title: Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework (Outputs 1.2 to 1.4).</p> <p>Output 1.1: To do a survey of the status of the genetic resources of the country is a monumental task (what does "status" mean in this context?) and even harder to go about addressing questions like "the type and location of known or potential genetic resources" (p.5) or determining and working on "potential" users and providers of GR. Since ALL genetic resources have "potential", the possible uses and users are impossible to define. The change from "potential" to "actual" is something that needs to be left to the market forces and advances in technology. All the "mapping" activities listed under Component 2 on page 5 (i.e. data-bases, key stakeholders, trends, etc.) will take an incredible amount of time and resources with a very uncertain return on investment. This line of work needs to be seriously reconsidered or dropped altogether.</p> <p>Output 1.5 Does the search for these effective mechanisms imply that all monetary and non-monetary benefits derived from ABS agreements between</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>users and providers will be centralized? This implies that no bilateral ABS agreements between users and providers will be possible without redistribution of benefits among everybody. Is that the case? Please explain as this has significant consequences for Algerian entrepreneurs. What incentives would local communities have to engage on ABS agreements knowing that their benefits will be significantly reduced (or disappear altogether), because they go into a central mechanism of benefit sharing?</p> <p>COMPONENT 2.</p> <p>Outcome 2.3. What is the purpose of this survey? Unless the Government of Algeria wants to have full control of all activities related to bio-prospecting in all sectors, it is not clear how the identification of all these initiatives (in so many sectors) will be used. Same for output 2.6.</p> <p>Output 2.7 How is the Government of Algeria planning on having a database on "bio-prospecting value-chains of potential interest for ABS, developed and made available to potential users". All these "potentials" cannot be mapped, much less distributed to yet another undetermined potential (i.e. users). What is this database on "biochemical resources" all about? Biochemical resources of Algerian origin stored in ex-situ facilities?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	5-1-14 The GEB associated with this project can only be identified with the full implementation of provisions of the NP. Cleared	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	5-1-14 Yes. Cleared	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	5-1-14 Yes. Cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	5-1-14 Yes. Page 8. Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the 	5-1-14 Yes. See page 7. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5-1-4 No. Funding is not sufficient to cover all activities. This project is overambitious Please seriously reconsider the outputs 1.1, 1.5, 2.6 and 2.7.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	5-1-14 Yes. Assuming the \$2M in-kind from the GoA become effective during project implementation. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	5-1-4 Yes. It is 10%. Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line	5-1-14 Yes. \$60,000 for a \$2M project (could have asked for \$100K). Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval,</u> if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	5-1-14 No. Please outstanding issues under 7 and 16.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	May 01, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**