



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

GEF ID:	4508		
Country/Region:	Algeria		
Project Title:	Environmentally sound management of POPs and destruction of PCBs wastes		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	POPs
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CHEM-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,300,000
Co-financing:	\$19,550,000	Total Project Cost:	\$25,850,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jie Pan	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Mohamed Eisa

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?	Yes. Algeria ratified the SC on 22/09/2006 and transmitted its NIP on 06/10/2007.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNIDO is well positioned to implement PCB and POPs waste management projects. Algeria's NIP was developed by UNIDO under a GEF EA project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the project matches UNIDO's thematic program and UNIDO has staff capacity in the country.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. 1.4.1: Amount of PCBs and PCB-related wastes disposed of, or decontaminated; measured in tons as recorded in POPs tracking tool.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. CHEM1	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	PCB management is a priority set out in Algeria's NIP.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Such information is not described on the current PIF. Please incorporate it into the revised PIF. September 13, 2011 (AS) - Comment cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	11. 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?	<p>Description of the baseline project/scenario is weak. A bilateral project supported by JICA(Japan) was quoted as an example to show how governmental institution capacity has been built up in the country. Yet there are no other POPs stockpile/PCB management projects in the country except for a PPG used by the World Bank to develop this proposed project. In addition to providing information on baseline projects/situation, please note that PPG outputs report should be included in CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - the Baseline Project has been clarified - Comment addressed</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>The incrementality of GEF intervention will be assessed when PIF clearly presents baseline projects/scenario in the country.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - Yes - Comment cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project framework is unclear. The project title indicated that this project is about ESM of POPs and destruction of PCB waste. And components in project framework did not touch upon ESM of POPs wastes. Please provide a clear and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>coherent project framework.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - the framework has been clarified with the development of an ESM for POPS with the associated regulatory and policy interventions along with the destruction of 5000 tonnes of PCB waste. - Comment cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The country has no regulations, policies, specific standards, and guidelines in place that specifically address PCBs and PCB-containing equipments. It lacks capacity for the analysis and monitoring of PCB releases by national laboratories. The implementation of this project is expected to help Algeria develop national capacity on the ESM of PCBs. Please flesh out how the proposed project will help the country to build/enhance capacity.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - the project framework clarifies how the project will function with and without GEF intervention. The description is satisfactory. - comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>16. 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?</p>	<p>Socio-economic benefits of this project are contribution to national development plan, the establishment of environmental technology facilities, and job creation. Gender dimension is slightly described in a very broad way. The GEF expects a detailed and specific description at the CEO endorsement stage.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>There is a lack of public participation/identification in the current PIF. This needs to be added to the current PIF.</p> <p>Two national companies are listed as the main PCB stakeholders in the country. How much percent of PCB-equipments are owned by these two companies? Please also identify other PCB holders, such as private sector.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - the PIF provides better statistics of the ownership of the PCB equipment. - Comment cleared.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Unstable political situation, project delay and low performance are identified as major risks and mitigation measures are included.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>It is mentioned that this project will try to seek coordination with other GEF Climate Change and International Waters projects. Please elaborate on how coordination with these projects is taken into account in project design.</p> <p>It is advised that this project seek coordination with another PCB project implemented by UNIDO and UNDP in Morocco.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 - Comment taken into consideration and incorporated into the PIF - Comment Cleared.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The role of relevant ministries and other stakeholders is not properly divided. Please provide such information. For	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>instance, what is the function of Ministry of Land Planning and Environment as the national Executing Agency? How about other relevant ministries such as: Ministere de l'Amenagement du Territoire, de l'Environnement et du Tourisme, Ministere de l'interieur (Industrial Chemicals and Pesticides), Ministere de l'Energie et des Mines, and Ministere de l'Agriculture (pesticides).</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - Comment addressed - cleared</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. 5% of total project cost.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The national government is providing all the co-financing. This project is applying for GEF grant 12 million, current co-financing ratio should be brought up to 1:4.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) the GEF grant request has been reduced and the objectives have been adjusted. The project should be able to achieve its objectives - Comment Cleared</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;	Low co-financing: 1:1.1	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	September 13, 2011 (AS) - the co-financing has been improved.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNIDO is bringing 200,000 as inkind co-financing to the project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		No.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	No	
	• Convention Secretariat?	No	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NO	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>PIF clearance is not recommended at this stage, following issues need to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weak baseline situation/projects and incrementality of GEF funding can not be supported (see 11 and 13) 2. Project framework is very sketchy. Components in project framework did not include ESM of POPs wastes as indicated by title. (see 14) 3. Please identify a comprehensive list of relevant stakeholders to include private sector and other ministries, identify their roles and mobilize support. (see 20) 4. Coordination with other ongoing projects unclear; (see 19) 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>5. How can sustainability be achieved through capacity building in this project? (see 10)</p> <p>6. Co-financing is too low.</p> <p>September 13, 2011 (AS) - The Country and the GEF agency have revised the PIF and reduced the amount of the grant and have adjusted the activities. The framework is clear and the objectives are resonable and achievable at the levels of GEF resources and co-financing. The Project is being recommended for further elaboration.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 27, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.