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

GEF ID:	**5675**		
Country/Region:	**Algeria**		
Project Title:	**Integrated municipal management model of household and similar waste with low greenhouse gas emissions**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5329 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCM-3; CCM-4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,187,671**
Co-financing:	**$14,200,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$17,487,671**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Franck Jesus**	Agency Contact Person:	**Robert Kelly,**

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**?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes. Algeria ratified the UNFCCC on June 9, 1993.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes, by letter dated Nov 27, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes. The remaining CCM allocation of Algeria is $7,660,000. This project requests a total of $3,600,000.	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Please clarify the rationale for respective share of the GEF financing amounts between CCM-3 and CCM-4. FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Comment 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?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes.	
	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?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Component 1: a) Please clarify whether the awareness raising and municipality prizes will be sufficient to incentivize households in properly sorting their	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		waste. b) Please clarify how the project will monitor whether effective household waste sorting is taking place and what the project plans to do if this is not the case. Component 2: c) Since the baseline description indicates that municipalities face a shortage in financial resources, please clarify (i) how the Eucalyptus municipality will manage to co-finance the proposed sorting plant, packer trucks and methanation plant; (ii) how the project will solve the financing constraint for future replications. d) Please clarify whether the packer trucks will run solely on biogas or whether they may also run on conventional fuels. In the former case, please clarify how the project will mitigate the risk of biogas unavailability. e) Please clarify how the project take into account the likely risk of having an importing second sorting process of households waste to deal with. Component 3 and 4: f) Please clarify (i) how the heat produced by methanation plant will be delivered to targeted greenhouse; (ii) the distance between the plant site and the greenhouses. Since heat consumption of greenhouses is likely to be seasonal and to vary depending on the time of day, please clarify how the plant energy production will cope with intermittent heat consumption.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		g) Please clarify how the composting will ensure a compost quality adequate for agricultural purposes: (i) with a stable and reliable NPK composition, (ii) without potentially harmful substances (plastic, heavy metalsâ€¦). h) Please clarify (i) the agricultural areas targeted for compost utilization, (ii) their distance to the composting unit and the distribution means, and (iii) the adequacy of the planned compost production and the estimated compost needs in the targeted areas. i) Please also clarify whether the use of compost may modify farmers' fertilization practices and induce changes in the associated GHG emissions. Component 5: j) Please clarify what is the proposed implementation mechanism for project replicability across 48 wilayas. k) Please clarify in particular how the project will secure means to provide the financial and technical assistance means necessary for effective replications. l) The GEF does not usually finance primary, secondary school and university programs. The GEF may only fund activities related to GHG emission reductions. Please revise component 5 accordingly. FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Comments cleared. By CEO endorsement, details are	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		expected on the actual ability of municipalities in Algeria to finance investments of the size of the proposed project, on their access to credit if needed, on the subsequent financial mechanism that may need to be established and implemented by the Government to address this eventual barrier to replication. The CEO endorsement request is expected to present an analysis from similar examples on the risk of inadequate waste sorting at household level, the associated cost and how the project take it into account. By CEO endorsement request, details are expected on the way heat produced by the methanation plant will be distributed and used, the costs and benefits associated to the heat distribution and the viability of a sustained heat consumption considering variations in heat needs (especially for greenhouses).	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: a) Please clarify how the project accounts for the energy consumption and emissions of dry-waste collection micro-enterprises and of the sorting plant. b) Please clarify the initial assumptions for the sorting and recycling sorting benefits and clarify how the GHG benefits estimation take into account potential pre-existing informal sorting and recycling. c) Please clarify how the GHG benefits from thermal energy generation take into account the intermittent heat needs from greenhouses.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Comments 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?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes.	
	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)	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Please assess the risk of having residents opposing the construction of a sorting unit or a methanation-composting plant in their neighborhood and clarify the mitigation means the project may develop. FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Comment cleared.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Please consider involving representatives of other municipalities (targeted for replication) as observers from the start of the project. FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Comment cleared. It is expected that the discussions during project preparation will help reassess the possibility to involve representatives of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		other municipalities (targeted for replication) as observers from the start of the project. Municipalities are likely to leanr more from the process (and mistakes if any) than from the results only.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: a) Please clarify why the Eucalyptus municipality was chosen and how it may help further replications. Please also clarify whether the project may help replication in other than mid-size municipalities. b) Please clarify whether the project estimated pay-back time (10-12 years) take into account (i) access to capital costs, (ii) costs associated with unsatisfactory household waste sorting, (iii) heat distribution costs, (iv) heat intermittent needs, and (iv) compost quality requirements. c) Considering the financial constraints of municipalities and the significant GEF support for the proposed investment (23%) please clarify how the project may help set up a financial mechanism that may induce further replications. FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Comments cleared.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: UNDP is bringing 1.5% of the total co-financing.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: Yes.	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: The PPG request does not deviate from the norm.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: The project is a grant.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?**	FJ - Jan 15, 2014: No. Please address the above comments. Please contact the GEF secretariat prior to re-submission. FJ - Jan 23, 2014: Yes, the project is technically cleared for consideration in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	FJ - Jan 23, 2014: a) By CEO endorsement, details are expected on the actual ability of municipalities in Algeria to finance investments of the size of the proposed project, on their access to credit if needed, on the subsequent financial mechanism that may need to be established and implemented by the Government to address this eventual barrier to replication. b) The CEO endorsement request is expected to present analysis from similar examples on the risk of inadequate waste	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sorting at household level, the associated cost and how the project take it into account. c) By CEO endorsement request, details are expected on the way heat produced by the methanation plant will be distributed and used, the costs and benefits associated to the heat distribution and the viability of a sustained heat consumption considering variations in heat needs (especially for greenhouses). d) It is expected that the discussions during project preparation will help reassess the possibility to involve representatives of other municipalities (targeted for replication) as observers from the start of the project. Municipalities are likely to leanr more from the process (and mistakes if any) than from the results only.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	January 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 23, 2014	
	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.**