

Basic Project Data

Project GEF ID:

<i>Staff</i>		<i>Processing Status</i>	<i>Date</i>
Program Manager	Ramos	Processing Stage	
Implementing Agency	UNDP	Concept Pipeline Discussion	
Regional Coordinator		PDF A - Agency Approval	
Executing Agency	National NGO	PDF B - CEO Approval	
		Bilateral Project Review Meeting	
		Work Program Submission and Approv	
		CEO Endorsement	
		Agency Approval	
		Project Completion	

Cost Summary

Cost Item	Years	Amount (USD'000)
<u>Preparation</u>		
- PDF A		\$0.03
- PDF B		
- PDF C		
<u>Project Allocation</u>		
- Executing Agency Fees and Costs		\$0.00
- Project Management Costs		\$0.00
- Other Incremental Costs		\$0.00

Completeness of Documentation

Focal Point.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Budget.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Logical Framework.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
STAP Review.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	Increment Cost.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Length.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disclosure of Administration Cost.....	<input type="checkbox"/>			Complete Cover Sheet....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

1. Country Ownership

Country Eligibility

Algeria ratified the CBD as reported in the proposal.

Evidence of Country Ownership/Country-Drivenness

Letter of endorsement.

2. Program and Policy Conformity

Portfolio Balance

This would be the second project in Algeria. During the Pilot Phase, GEF funded the project: El Kala National Park and wetlands, which has been implemented with some apparent difficulty. A biodiversity enabling activity is underway through UNDP.

Thematically, proposed activities are not new, as substantive support has gone to dryland biodiversity in various parts of Africa.

Program Conformity

Proposed activities seem to conform well, with OP#1.

Replicability

Some potential replicability in the arid zone of northern Africa.

Potential Global Environmental Benefits of Project

Somewhat questionable. The areas seem small for long-term biodiversity conservation, with apparent substantive grazing. Other threats are active and underlying causes likely to continue to operate.

Sustainability

Apparently limited. No provisions appear for long-term sustainability in the proposal.

Baseline Course of Action

Limited. A key aspect for site management would be the control of grazing. Although the three sites are described, including threats, underlying causes affecting them are not clearly outlined.

Alternative Action Supported by project

Government funded programs for agriculture, covering dryland oases, small food production farmers, and revised policy framework. However, again, underlying causes need further addressing. Project activities, although relevant, seem unlikely to reduce pressure on the reserves, particularly those dealing with sustainable use activities. Some activities, such as related to rehabilitation of degraded sites are not identified (output 2.1, 4) and need identification. How much budget would be spent on these?

Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy

Consultations have apparently taken place. Do these include nomad populations?

Private Sector Involvement

None.

3. Appropriateness of GEF Financing

Incremental Cost

Project proponents had difficult time in assessing baseline components, taking the approach of providing "reasonable" estimates based on current participation of various actors. GEF contribution is estimated as 37% of total project costs. The various numbers from the budget, incremental cost matrix and the summary of the proposal do not match. Please correct.

Appropriateness of Financial Modality Proposed

Grant resources requested.

Financial Sustainability of the GEF-Funded Activity

Not assured, although the proposal argues that it is based on the consultation process put in place, the level of commitment shown by government, network of NGOs and local populations on project formulation. Capacity built is also used as a criterion for sustainability.

Absorptive Capability

There is no information that allows to judge the absorptive capacity of the NGO proposed to manage the project

Cost Effectiveness

4. Coordination with Other Institutions

Collaboration

Complementarity with Ongoing Activities

5. Responsiveness to Comments and Evaluations

Core Commitments

No UNDP financial contribution to the project.

Linkages

Project linked to other bilateral work underway (French and Canadian), and the work by IFAD.

Consultation and Coordination

Consistency w/previous upstream consultations, project preparation work, and processing conditions

Monitoring & evaluation: Minimum GEF Standards, ME plan, proposed indicators, lessons from PIRs and Project Lessons Study

Proposed indicators focus more on processes (e.g., number of trained people, number of awareness workshops) than in true impact (e.g., has. of land sustainable protected, or managed; grazing controlled, etc.).

Indicators

Verifiable but focused on process, not substance.

Implementing Agencies' Comments

None received to date.

STAP Review

non applicable.

Council members' Comments

None yet

Technical Assurances

Convention Secretariat

None yet.

Other Technical Comments

Further Processing

The Secretariat believes the project is overly optimistic to what it is trying to accomplish with limited funding and proposed timeframe (3 years). It will be important to clarify issues highlighted above, particularly: (a) clarify the global environmental issues to be gained, given the small size of the proposed protected areas, and the significant threats these sites face; (b) how underlying causes are likely to be addressed as part of the baseline? (c) financial sustainability of the project: What are the plans for activities to continue after three years? (d) considering the small size for sites under protection, how the project would clearly proceed in managing the surrounding areas, type of sustainable use activities to be funded, type of restoration activities to be carried out, etc.); (e) what is the absorptive capacity of the NGO to carry out this complex project? (f) the institutional set-up proposed seems simple. However, the Pilot Phase project financed in El Kala, faced serious institutional and security issues. Would you please clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of the various institutions involved in the project?; (g) the various numbers from the budget, incremental cost matrix and the summary of the proposal do not match. Please correct.