

Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation criteria in sectoral and intersectoral public policies and programs to safeguard threatened wildlife in Argentina

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID
10085

Countries
Argentina

Project Title
Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation criteria in sectoral and intersectoral public policies and programs to safeguard threatened wildlife in Argentina

GEF Agency(ies)
UNDP

Agency ID
UNDP: 6198

GEF Focal Area(s)
Biodiversity

Program Manager
Mark Zimsky

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, project is fully aligned with GEF-7 BD mainstreaming strategy.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, clear and realistic components geared towards a very discrete set of outcomes that are consistent with the GEF's theory of change of biodiversity mainstreaming.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, the amounts and types of cofinancing are adequately documented and consistent with the Policy and associated definitions with the exception of investment mobilized. In-kind contributions can not be considered "investment mobilized". Please revise.

In addition, please enter the entire justification of investment mobilized and cofinancing directly into the portal not in an attachment.

Finally, for each amount of indicative co-financing, please review carefully whether the co-financing represents 'Investment Mobilized' or 'Recurrent Expenditures'. For details, please refer to Paragraph 9 of the Co-Financing Policy (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Policy.pdf) and the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

11/20/2018

Adequate response and clarification by agency provided.

Agency Response

This has been revised accordingly – no in-kind has been included in the “investment mobilized” category. Furthermore, the following table (Annex F) detailing the specific programs within this category of co-financing has been provided in the justification.

Annex F: Description of Cofinance Resources under Investment Mobilized Categorization
Description of CoFin Resources under Investment Mobilized Categorization)

Institution	Investment Mobilized	Amount
SAyDS	Implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	\$ 5,050,000
	National Program for the Conservation of Endangered Species - Zero Extinction Action Plan	\$ 531,000
	National Native Forests Law funds for environmental services provided by the forest (PES)	\$1,000,000
	Open Data Portal	\$ 77,250
Secretariat of the Government of Energy	RenovAr Programme	\$ 800,000
Ministry of Transport's National Directorate of Roadway	Federal Road Programme	\$ 6,200,000
	Total	\$ 13,658,250

We have reviewed the guidance documents and believe the current co-financing table adequately reflects the definitions as stipulated by GEF. The co-financing identified as investment mobilized is neither in-kind nor recurrent expenditures.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, GEF financing and fee in line with policies.

Agency Response

STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, Argentina has adequate biodiversity resources to fund this project.
Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, adequate resources are available in the focal area.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes.

Please clarify if there are any expected mitigation benefits from this project, and if so, please include them.

11/20/2018

Adequate clarification provided by the agency.

Agency Response

The expected direct mitigation benefits are provided on page 5 and are based on support for the transition toward wind energy. The project will directly impact the planning criteria of RenovAr wind parks. The pilot site will provide direct benefits but the specific timeframe for completion of the wind park and the associated generation of mitigation benefits will be determined during the PPG.

There is inadequate information at this time to measure expected indirect benefits, but these will be considered during the PPG phase.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes. However, please apply, in the Taxonomy, Rio Markers for Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Change Mitigation. Each project needs to select one marker (0,1 or 2) for adaptation AND one marker (0,1 or 2) for mitigation. For further details, please refer to the hover tip that links to the complete Taxonomy, including definitions of the Rio Markers.

11/10/2018

Cleared.

Agency Response

The Rio Markers are now included in the template.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Adequate explanation and analysis of the root causes and barriers and a thorough problem analysis underpins the logic of the targeted project design.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Full elaboration of the baseline scenario underpinning the main themes and components of the project's strategy is provided.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, alternative scenario is described fully and adequately in the text and in Annex E.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, full alignment with GEF-7 BD strategy on mainstreaming and very consistent with GEF's theory of change on sectoral mainstreaming.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, well elaborated IC reasoning at the PIF stage.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, reasonable and achievable outcomes as measured by core indicators.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Project is designed to be sustainable through embedding policy changes and the appropriate incentives in development decision making such that that once these are established and implemented, the mainstreaming benefits will continue after project closure.

The project is innovative in the focused use of spatial data to better plan road and energy infrastructure to be less impactful on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes. By the time of CEO endorsement please provide more detailed and higher resolution maps and geo-references of each of the four cases.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, very detailed analysis of stakeholders and stakeholder roles and engagement opportunities and plans.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, very thorough and solid articulation of gender context.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Due to the nature of the project design, private sector will be fully engaged in each of the four project sites and the approach is logical.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, risks are adequately identified and honestly assessed with appropriate mitigation measures proposed at PIF stage.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes. Given the considerable complementarity amongst many GEF-funded biodiversity mainstreaming projects in Argentina, by the time of CEO endorsement please elaborate more detailed coordination plans and cross-fertilization strategies between GEF-supported initiatives trying to advance the biodiversity mainstreaming agenda in Argentina complete with allocated budget for these targeted cooperation and collaboration activities.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, project priorities are fully aligned with the NBSAP and NAPA as well.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes, and largely embedded in the project design through Component One and the NBIS which will be the most sustainable KM approach for Argentina. In addition, standard KM approaches are identified for external dissemination.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Yes in a letter dated September 24, 2018.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/10/2018

Yes. The PIF is being recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/15/2018

Please note comments above to be addressed by the time of CEO endorsement.

In addition, please identify in the project logframe how the project will measure and monitor the aim under Case 2 to reduce habitat fragmentation.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>