



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9806</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Algeria</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Rehabilitation and Integrated Sustainable Development of Algerian Cork Oak Forest Production Landscapes</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,411,644</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$23,737,811</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$27,149,455</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Pascal Martinez</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Maude Veyret-Picot</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>24 March 2017</p> <p>The project is aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework. The project is also explicitly articulated with the Aichi Targets but not all of them are associated with clear SMART indicators. Please be more specific identifying the indicators, for instance in the table provided in the paragraph</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		101. 13 April 2017 Cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	24 March 2017 Yes and notably with recent policy, report and initiatives on forestry development, biodiversity and land degradation. Cleared.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	24 March 2017 Yes. Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	24 March 2017  1- The fact the forest is considered as an isolated sector is identified as one of the barriers but the project activities don't clearly explain how the other sectors will be involved. Please provide clarification about the articulation with relevant other sectors that can overcome this barrier.  2- The table in paragraph 92 provide information regarding the barrier removal strategy and is very welcome. However, the proposal needs to be more explicit regarding	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>some specific barriers and threats explaining briefly how the proposed activities will be efficient to address them. In particular, what will make the replanting success rate better (already very low even in one of the most successful Wilayas), what concretely will protect the forest against encroachment, overgrazing and over-harvesting especially from non beneficiary but neighboring stakeholders? Why is the forest fire prevention failing and what will the project propose accordingly? Please briefly complete how the activities will address the main barriers and threats (one sentence or two could be added at the beginning of each component description).</p> <p>13 April 2017</p> <p>1- Cleared</p> <p>2- Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>24 March 2017</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>1- The outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 have repeated paragraphs (68=71 and 69=72) and the possible activities are not specified (unlike for the output 111). It is explained that "the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>activities will be adapted as the process evolves". What is intended to do in the corresponding pilot sites is thus particularly vague. Please adjust the organization of the outcome 1.1 so as to avoid repetitions and be as specific as possible regarding the planned activities (even informing that these activities may be adjusted during the PPG phase or project implementation).</p> <p>2- in the annex p. 30 the map covers the text. Please adjust accordingly.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>3- The participatory process is presented for one output of component 1 but the involvement of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries remains unclear for this component. Please provide information about the modalities local stakeholders (in particular local communities, NGOs and private sector) will be involved in the creation of value from cork oak ecosystem products, goods and services.</p> <p>4- The international cooperation already provided assistance to establish a traceability system (the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>DGF did too), an analysis of the value chains and developed an action plan for NTFPs. The proposal mentions that the output 2.1.2 will be further studied at PPG using this baseline but the concrete expected result is not clearly informed (including in the title of the output). Please be more specific regarding the possible activities during the project implementation and the expected results.</p> <p>5- The outcome 2.2 aims at establishing a clear plan of action for developing IFES at three cork oak forests in Algeria .Considering the importance of reducing pressure on the ecosystems as a key for the project success, more effective actions beyond the plan appears to be necessary. Please consider among the expected results the implementation of actions and the establishment of IFES, even in pilot phase.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>6- The communication strategy is important to share best practices and lessons learned. In addition to FAO FRA and GFLRM, please consider also using the Silva Mediterranea Committee and relevant research networks for that output in the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>proposal.</p> <p>13 April 2017</p> <p>Component 1: 1- Cleared. 2- Cleared.</p> <p>Component 2: 3- Cleared. 4- Cleared. 5- Cleared. 6- Cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>24 March 2017</p> <p>Among the stakeholders identified, the private sector involved in the value chain doesn't seem to be well represented. Please explain further who are the private stakeholders that can be involved in the project and how they will be considered and included.</p> <p>13 April 2017</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>24 March 2017</p> <p>Yes, the country hasn't used any of its allocated STAR resources yet.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>24 March 2017</p> <p>Yes. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>27 March 2017</p> <p>Not yet. Please address the comments above, specifying in the review sheet where they are addressed in the PIF and providing a version of the PIF where the changes are visible.</p> <p>13 April 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the clarifications and complements. Yes, the proposal can now be recommended for clearance and PPG.</p> <p>Please be aware of what is announced to be prepared during the PPG phase, including the analysis regarding the communication strategy with relevant partners and programs such as SilvaÂ Mediterranea, the targets of component 2, the assessment and final selection of the pilot sites, the detail of the activities under the outcome</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		1.1, the update and elaboration of the traceability plan, the review of the analysis of the NTFP value chains, the development of the M&E system, the details regarding the different Ministries' involvement, and the analysis of the gender situation at the proposed sites.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.