Part I: Project Information
GEF ID: 10085
Project Title: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation criteria in sectoral and intersectoral public policies and programs to safeguard threatened wildlife in Argentina.
Date of Screening: December 5, 2018
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski
Panel Member: Brian Child
STAP Overall Assessment   Minor issues to be considered during project design.

Part I: Project Information   **What STAP looks for**
B. Indicative Project Description Summary

Project Objective: To mainstream conservation criteria in sectoral and intersectoral public policies and contribute to their effective implementation to safeguard threatened wildlife.

Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?

Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits?
	Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.

1.   Project description. Briefly describe:

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?

For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?

Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?

Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?
For multiple focal area projects:
are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;

are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and
how did these lessons inform the design of this project?

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

What is the theory of change?

What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?

	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits? LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable? Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined? Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?

7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up

Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?

Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?

Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?

1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.

Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?

What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd

Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?

Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?

5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design

Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?

Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?

For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:

·   How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?

·   Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?

·   Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?

	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them? Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited? How have these lessons informed the project's formulation? Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects? What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?

STAP Notes

STAP agrees with the general premise of the proposed project, but there is insufficient technical substance and quantitative analysis of the problem in the narrative. For example, the project would be improved if the negative impact of wind turbines and roads on wildlife was quantified, and if a technical description and back-of-the-envelope costing was provided to show how this could be resolved, and a rough indication of the expected global environmental benefits (GEBs). The link between infrastructure and Argentina's biodiversity is not clearly drawn.

The proposal claims that wildlife is "decimated by poaching and illegal trade" without insufficient substantiation to understand the scope of the problem. The basic issue in Argentina is the disappearance of public wildlife on private land, and this fundamental mismatch is not addressed in the PIF. Indeed, much of the hunting in Argentina is of exotic, introduced species (e.g. water buffalo, red stag) because laws do not generally allow hunting of wild species, which are consequently replaced. In this respect, the sustainable use of vicuña in some South American countries may provide some useful lessons for Argentina.

Given the generic nature of this proposal, it is

Response

The objective is clearly defined and related to the problem diagnosis which focuses on several key sectors: energy, road construction, hunting, agriculture, to varying degrees.

Yes in general. However, the project seems quite ambitious by proposing to work across several sectors (see above), scales (national/regional), and through a variety of proposed mechanisms (coordination, policy reform, guidance documents, etc.). The project might benefit from narrowing the focus to target just one industry in depth since each one is complex and faces multiple unique issues.

As above, there are multiple interventions so some information is provided on short-term and medium-term effects but not in a comprehensive or systematic manner.

Planned outcomes include consolidated data, strengthened sectoral policies, maintenance or increase of several key species. Of these, only the last item can be considered a GEB. The others are means to this end.

Difficult to say. The assumption is that policies in several disparate areas will be modified to incorporate BD considerations. If successful, the positive impacts could be significant.

No clear theory of change is presented.

Main threats to Argentina's biodiversity include 1) habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation caused by agricultural expansion; 2) large transport and energy infrastructure (resulting in habitat loss?); and 3) overexploitation of wildlife through hunting and poaching. While each of these threats are valid, more information is necessary to connect them to each other and present a comprehensive picture of the impact these threats have on biodiversity and their relative importance.

See above comment.

N/A

A scientific baseline is not provided in detail, apart from some information on threatened species. For example, it would be useful to have an overview of quantified trends in land cover and land use since one of the major threats is habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation.
Information is provided regarding total expected area of improved management, as well as avoided greenhouse gases mitigated, and carbon sequestered. It is not clear how proposed activities will directly result in these benefits. The connections need to be made more clear.
No

N/A

N/A

N/A

Not entirely clear but the assumption seems to be that improved data, coordination, policy changes to mainstream biodiversity will lead to changes that will minimize the impact of agricultural and industrial expansion and legal and illegal wildlife hunting.
Strengthen policy, followed by harmonized policies.

1. Improved data system (NBIS); 2. intersectoral strategy developed; 3. portfolio of instruments developed for key sectors; 4. cpacity buidling and coordination; instruments applied in pilot areas; 5. communicate results and best practices.

Mechanisms are plausible but each sector has its own issues that will require tailor-made solutions. Also not clear how the project will handle to trade-offs that will inevitably arise across sectors, development objectives, national/regional priorities, etc.
Not specifically.

Unclear

N/A

Main benefits have to do with conservation of key species. In theory this is measurable and perhaps this will be addressed during the data collection and consolidation phase.
No. The project is too ambitious given the limited resources. Better to focus on one sector or one geographic area for project demonstration (Component 2)
Yes, in terms of hectares under improved practices and carbon mitigated though methodology is not available to assess these proposed benefits.

See above comment.

The road infrastructure activity of the PIF is concerned with increased flooding due to climate change and will consider this when proposing new road development.

The most innovative aspect of this project is the development of a merged, geospatial database that integrates biological and infrastructure-related information that can (in theory) lead to improved decisions based on comprehensive planning.

This is to be done through Component 3 on knowledge management, the details of which should be made more specific during PPG phase. Scaling up is highly dependent upon successful pilots, which may be diminished if resources are spread too thinly across sectors.
Successful mainstreaming of biodiversity into the national and regional planning process across all of the identified sectors would likely occur in steps. If successful, however, it would result in transformational and long-term change.
A map is provided in Annex A. However, the project sites are not geo-referenced.

Most of the stakeholders identified are at the national level (ministries, etc.) which will be important for coordinating sectoral plans. However, for the site specific projects, the local and provincial agencies will likely plan a far greater role in terms of approving (or blocking) projects. Also as the focus is on key sectors such as agriculture, transport, energy, hunting, it would seem that private sector groups and communities will need to be engaged early on in the process to better understand what incentives will be required to make necessary changes to business-as-usual operations. THis is referred to in the PIF as something that will be further elaborated during PPG phase.
See above comment.

Yes

Gender issues are adequately addressed.

The risk identified are quite substantial in that they risk derailing the overall success of the project and the achievement of GEBs.

More information is needed on the potential impacts of projects on local communities who might be impacted by siting of wind farms, roads, etc.

The project discusses the potential impact of increased flooding on roads; however, specific scenarios and mitigation measures are not outlined in the PIF.

Not at PIF stage

See above comment.

The project could engage the scientific community. Currently only researchers are identified under "CSO" as potential stakeholders.

Many other projects (GEF and non-GEF) are listed. However, this project should also tap into the recently announced "Jaguar 2030 Roadmap" since this is one of the species the project is targeting in terms of supporting stable or increased numbers.

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Component 3 is dedicated to knowledge management and includes standard activities such as communication and outreach and monitoring and evaluation. Given the objective of collecting large amounts of data in a GIS, there is opportunity to incorporate this type of knowledge into the KM component whereby systems are developed to regularly update and share information and build capacity so that these sytems persist after the project has ended.
See above comment.