



**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)
FY 2022**

GEF - IDB

IMPORTANT: The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year 2022 (July 1st, 2021 to June 30th, 2022)

of PIR: 5th

PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy in Low-income Housing		
Project's GEF ID:	4861	Project's IDB ID:	AR-G1002; GRT/FM-15083-AR, GRT/FM-15083-AR-1, GRT/FM-15083-AR-2
Country/ies	Argentina		
GEF Focal Area	Climate Change		
Executing Agency	Ministry of Territorial Development and Habitat (<i>Ministerio de Desarrollo Territorial y Hábitat, MDTyH</i> by its acronym in Spanish) and Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (<i>Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, MAyDS</i> by its acronym in Spanish)		
Project Finance and Disbursements:	GEF Trust Fund	\$	14,630,855
	Co-finance at CEO Endors. / Approv.	\$	71,780,224
	TOTAL Project Cost (GEF Grant + co-finance)	\$	86,411,079
	Total disbursements of GEF Grant resources as of end of June 30 th , 2022 (cumulative)	\$	2,429,555.84
	Date of First Disbursement		08/15/2018
	Project Dates	Agency Approval Date	
	Effectiveness (Start) Date		03/15/2017
	Original Last Disbursement Expiration Date ¹ (OED)		09/15/2021
	Current OED		12/14/2021
	Estimated Operational Close Date ² (EOC)		05/15/2023
	Actual Date of EOC, if applicable		Click here to enter text.

¹ For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Completion Date".

² For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Financial Closure Date".

Project Evaluation:	Mid-term Date (Expected or Actual)	04/28/2020
	Terminal evaluation Date (Expected)	12/15/2023

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING (DO) & ASSESSMENT

To reduce energy consumption, electricity as well as natural gas, and related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from social housing in Argentina through the development of new minimum habitability standards for the construction of new social housing with energy efficiency (EE) and renewable energy (RE).

Make an overall assessment and provide a rating³ of “likelihood of achieving project objective” during the period (2021-2022). Describe any significant environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation.

OVERALL (DO) ASSESSMENT	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>The development objective rating of the Project for the reporting period was rated as Satisfactory (S) due to the following considerations:</p> <p>In 2021, the IDB and Executing Agencies agreed on an action plan to accelerate the execution of main processes to improve the project’s performance. Due to the constant accompaniment and follow-up from the IDB team, it was possible to develop all the activities and progress in the execution in the terms that were agreed.</p> <p>Considering that the construction of housing prototypes is the critical product of this project, it must be noted that during the first semester 2022 three projects in three different provinces could start. Meanwhile, the other five provinces could advance in its technical specs, achieving the technical no objection by the Team Leader. Four of them are currently managing its bidding process.</p> <p>Related to the expiration date, it was agreed to grant gradual extensions subject to the achievement of the agreements. The first extension is until May 2023 and the condition to give another one is having all constructions of social housing started. Due to the considerations mentioned, it is possible to affirm that by that date the works will be started so that the project can extended to meet the project objectives and to finish the products originally planned.</p>	<p>Marginally Satisfactory (MS)</p>	<p>Satisfactory (S)</p>

³ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT

*Make an assessment and provide ratings⁴ of overall Implementation Progress, including information on progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities from July 1st 2021 until June 30th, 2022. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.***

OVERALL (IP) ASSESSMENT	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>The Project records important implementation achievements and progress in the reporting period and it can be rated as Highly Satisfactory (HS) due to the following considerations for each component:</p> <p>Component 1: Low-carbon social housing prototypes. The objectives of this component were accomplished (designing sustainable housing prototypes for the different climatic regions of the country and starting the constructions in three provinces). In detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bioclimatic housing prototypes were developed under 4 different categories of energy efficiency in the 8 provinces that are part of the Program. In all of them, the Executing Agency has obtained the technical No Objection from the IDB because they meet all the requirements demanded by the Program. This was possible because of the constant monitoring and technical support made by the Team Leader and a consultant specialized in bioclimatic housing. • In the reporting period, construction has begun in 3 provinces: Chubut (61.14% of work progress), Tierra del Fuego (17.66% of work progress) and Neuquén (9.37%). The rest of the works plan to start on different dates, all before the new current expiration date (May 2023). <p>Component 2. Monitoring and evaluation of social housing prototypes. The Executing Agency finished the design of the methodology and technical guidance for monitoring and evaluating the social housing prototypes. The implementation of this work will be performed after the construction of the sustainable housing. However, there are some activities that must be highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A training on the use of dynamic simulation tools for designing and evaluating energy behavior was developed during the period of this report. This training was oriented to technical professionals and teams working in housing design and planning in sub-executing agencies. • The executing agency has been working on the documentation of the bidding process for the acquisition of the material needed to measure and evaluate the energy behavior of the constructions. It is planned to obtain them during the first half of 2023. 	Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

⁴ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

<p>Component 3. Development and adoption of Energy Efficiency (EE) and Renewable Energies (RE) standards. In relation to this component, the main progress is the adoption of new EE and RE standards in the design of the bioclimatic houses and the incorporation of specific strategies to adapt each model to the different bioclimatic regions from Argentina. This was possible in a short period of time due to the predisposition of the executing agencies and the constant technical support given by the IADB consultants.</p> <p>Component 4. Strengthening of the local Energy Efficiency (EE) and Renewable Energies (RE) market. Aims to promote the development of new instruments that strengthen the construction value chain with EE and RE to maximize sustainability in the housing sector. To this end, different actions are carried out with the following objectives: promote innovation in the construction industry; give greater visibility to the sector; encourage the creation of new mechanisms and incentives for the local market related to the EE and RE. Additionally, the executing agency have worked towards the generation of instruments to compose an updated regulatory framework consistent with these interests.</p> <p>Component 5. Dissemination of results. Because this component depends on the completion of the works, it has not been possible to disseminate the results obtained. However, it is noteworthy that the projects carried out by the program have been widely disseminated and that the web platform of this operation is permanently updated in order to give visibility to these topics (Renewable Energies, Energy Efficiency and others).</p> <p>Portfolio review agreements. Another general aspect to note is that the Program has managed to finalize all portfolio review agreements within the agreed deadlines.</p> <p>Strengthening of institutional capacities. To strength institutional capacities to respond to Argentina's climate challenges in social housing, an important agenda of workshops, events and trainings was carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A survey of needs and vacancies in the professional sector that provides services in the design and construction of homes. ● New training programs for three ranges of target audiences that are involved in bidding process. ● A diploma oriented to professionals from the public and private sector. ● A course oriented to construction workers and professionals involved in site inspection. Its objective is to strengthen the capacities of the sector that provides services for the maintenance and installation of active renewable energy systems. <p>COVID-19. During the reporting period, there were strong waves of COVID-19 infection in Argentina. Although this epidemiological situation generated small delays in some work schedules, the experience acquired for remote work in</p>		
--	--	--

<p>the previous year made possible to continue with critical tasks, such as preparation of bidding documentation.</p> <p>Another advantage provided by remote work was the agility in the resolution of technical and legal aspects of the bidding documentation. In this way, the impact was less than expected and a collaborative and dynamic work scheme was developed between the executing agency, the sub-executing agencies and the IABD team.</p>		
--	--	--

RISK RATING & ASSESSMENT

For fiscal year 2022, make any adjustments necessary to the assessment ratings⁵ of overall Project Risk⁶ that you provided in the last PIR (2010-2021). Please include details and remedial measures for High and Substantial Risks, specifying who will be responsible for these measures.

OVERALL RATING FOR PROJECT RISK	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>Risks identified during the reporting period led to an overall risk rating of Modest (M). Please see details as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of continuous communication with companies in the context of an innovative project for which they may require frequent guidance. This risk can be mitigated by improving communication channels, establishing those responsible for resolving doubts by the executing agency and ensuring regular follow-up meetings. This rating is Low (L). • Absence of key technical human resources, even temporarily. This risk can be mitigated by developing specific training for qualified personnel from the different provinces where the operation is carried out. This risk is Modest (M) • Lack of bidders due to adverse economic conditions and high level of uncertainty. This risk can be mitigated by the implementation of price redetermination systems based on clear and objective indicators. This risk is considered Substantial (S), so the executing agency must include these systems in its projects. The IDB team will be responsible for supervising its implementation. • Lack of simultaneity in the execution of the works in the different bioclimatic zones which may require the revision of the planning of the deadlines of the rest of the components. Due to the different dates on which the bidding processes began, this risk must be accepted, and its effects mitigated. To do this, the planning must be reviewed frequently, and delays monitored to avoid misalignments in the planning of the rest of the components. This rating is Modest (M). • Underperformance of the pilots due to the technology type or the improper use and maintenance by the users. This will be evaluated once the new 	<p>Modest Risk (M)</p>	<p>Modest Risk (M)</p>

⁵ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

⁶ These should include risks identified at CEO Endorsement AND any new risks identified during implementation.

<p>technology is tested. However, the teams are confident this should not be a problem and the project team is currently assessing strategies to prevent and to react in case is needed. This rating is Low (L).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many stakeholders in the decision-making process: The complexity of the institutional arrangements, including many actors involved at the national and provincial levels, is a risk that will continue during all the project's life cycle, including the evaluation and dissemination period. To mitigate this risk, the IDB team and the Executing Agencies are holding meetings periodically to discuss and resolve execution issues. The rating is Modest Risk (M). 		
---	--	--

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

*Please add information on any progress, challenges and outcomes with regards to stakeholder engagement, based on the project's activities during its implementation through the 2010-2022 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.***

Even though the COVID-19 restrictions were an obstacle to held meetings between the stakeholders, it was possible to carry them out virtually. Given the special circumstances, also other ways of communication were allowed. Nowadays, public agencies are returning to the office so some of the meetings can be arranged in person. However, most of them are still virtual to facilitate communication amongst stakeholders in all the country.

Additionally, the restrictions imposed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic prevented the organization of face-to-face visits to the works. However, in recent months it was agreed to develop a supervision agenda once there is considerable work progress (greater than 50%). The supervisions will have the objectives of detecting good practices in the works, examining compliance with the requirements demanded in the bidding documentation and planning the stage of measurement and evaluation of the energy behavior that will be developed later.

One aspect to highlight is the greater involvement of the **Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development** (MAYDS) and from the **Provincial Housing Institutes** (Instituto Provincial de Vivienda, IPV) by its acronym in Spanish) in the development of knowledge dissemination agendas. This guarantees that the Program manages to install capacity and specific technical knowledge to generate replicability and scalability in the design and construction of bioclimatic houses with energy efficiency criteria and the incorporation of renewable energies.

GENDER

Please add information on any progress, challenges and outcomes with regards to any and all gender-responsive measures that were undertaken in the project's activities during the 2021-2022 GEF Fiscal Year. Also: Were indicators on gender equality and women's empowerment incorporated in the project's results framework? (Yes/No). If applicable, include the indicator with its baseline, target and current value (2021-2022).

No. The project did not consider gender indicators in its results framework.

KNOWLEDGE

Please add information on knowledge activities and products developed in relation to the project (with GEF or non-GEF resources), with special emphasis on activities carried out during the 2021-2022 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

In the reported period, we have been working on a new publication "Ecological Design: Strategies for the Vulnerable City: Urban green infrastructure and public space in Latin America and the Caribbean". This publication contains a report on urban and national policies, strategies and case studies to enhance public space and territory in the most vulnerable urban areas of Latin America and the Caribbean through green infrastructures and nature-based solutions. The social, economic and environmental advantages of intervening in public space through nature are highlighted, outlining a series of criteria and implementation strategies. 30 projects of public space and green infrastructure developed in Latin America and the Caribbean in the last twenty years are presented, distributed in various biogeographic regions and inserted in very different contexts. For each project, there is an analysis of the conditions of the environments, the main risks, the solutions adopted, the construction and implementation processes, the social and environmental benefits provided, and their evolution over time. It is available online in the IDB web site and by the moment it registers more than 750 downloads (<https://publications.iadb.org/es/disenio-ecologico-estrategias-para-la-ciudad-vulnerable-infraestructuras-verdes-urbanas-y-espacio>).

As mentioned in the section "IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT", several actions were carried out in relation to knowledge and strengthening of technical capacities:

- A diploma oriented to professionals from the public and private sector was outlined.
- A course was designed for construction workers and professionals involved in site inspection. Its objective is to strengthen the capacities of the sector that provides services for the maintenance and installation of active renewable energy systems.
- A training on the use of dynamic simulation tools for designing and evaluating energy behavior was developed during the period of this report. This training was oriented to technical professionals and teams working in housing design and planning in sub-executing agencies.

CHANGES TO PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

IDB’s policies apply throughout the execution of GEF projects. Most changes considered “minor amendments” by GEF would, according to IDB’s regulations, norms, and policies, require EITHER no contractual adjustment at all [e.g., small changes in outputs or parallel co-financing] OR a contractual adjustment that does not require Board approval [e.g., extension of date of last disbursement]. These changes should be reported in the PIR for the Fiscal Year during which the changes took effect.

Please indicate in the table below (with an ‘x’ under Yes or No) which aspects of the project were affected by the changes and provide a short description, as well as a reference to any supporting material uploaded into the Bank’s systems:

In the Reporting Year, were any changes made that affected:	YES	NO	If YES, please briefly describe changes made:	Link to supporting material
Results Matrix/ Outputs: P(a) EOP values, wording of outputs, or addition of outputs?		x		
Component Cost: funding allocated per component (vs. originally approved)?		x		
GEF Co-financing: changes in sources and/or amounts expected?		x		
Dates reported to GEF (e.g., effectiveness, first/ extension of last disbursement, midterm evaluation)?	x		An extension of 20 months (until May 2023) was granted to achieve all the bidding processes of component 1.	https://idbg.sharepoint.com/_layouts/15/DocIdRedirect.aspx?ID=EZSHARE-1163182790-4545
Executing mechanism (e.g., change of Executing Agency or function of advisory committee)?		x		
Other implementation arrangements (e.g., coordination with other GEF projects)?		x		
Financial [risk] management (e.g., waiver for annual audit or change in % to be justified)?		x		
Management of E&S risks and impacts (e.g., changes to ESMP)?		x		
Management of other risks (e.g., changes due to health/ Covid-19 or security concerns)?		x		

Please note: Should the request or need for any changes arise that, by IDB’s regulations, norms and policies, require authorization at the Manager level or above [see OA-420, OA-421, OA-430 and OA-431], project teams should invariably get in touch with the IDB-GEF Coordination team, preferably prior to discussing such changes with counterparts to ensure proper coordination with and reporting to the GEF.

Examples include, but are not limited to: (i) All substantial and fundamental changes covered by the OA-430; (ii) Changes to the general or specific project objective(s) or to the project’s area of intervention; (iii) Results Matrix/ Outcomes & Impacts: P(a) value, wording of existing or addition of Outcomes, Outcome Indicators, Impacts and/or Impact Indicators; (iv) Components: changes in types of activities that may be financed with project funding (eligibility of expenses); (v) Total Amount of Project Financing (above originally approved amount).

LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES

*If the project generated any lessons learned or best practices during the 2021-2022 GEF Fiscal Year, please provide a short description. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.***

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
Renewable Energies	Executing agency has to provide IPVs with information about suppliers and manufacturers of ER equipment and assist them in consulting and evaluating bids for the purchase of the best equipment.
Technical support from the IADB team	The support and advice given by the expert hired by the IADB has been important in the progress of the IPVs. Thanks to this support, it is possible to resolve doubts related to the design of the houses, the bidding processes and the design of different trainings and strengthening workshops.
Project monitoring	Is important to hold regular inter-ministerial meetings and with the members of the project committee.
Project monitoring	Is necessary to hold regular follow-up meetings with the IDB to monitor work progress and other issues relevant to the fulfillment of the project's objectives.
Dissemination of the program	It becomes necessary to keep the website updated with the progress of the project to guarantee transparency in the information and to disseminate the actions that are carried out in terms of renewable energies and energy efficiency.

ANNEX 1. DEFINITION OF RATINGS

Development Objective Ratings

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress Ratings

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of **all** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **some** components requiring remedial action.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **most** components requiring remedial action.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of **none** of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings

Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks of projects should be rated on the following scale:

1. **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
2. **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
3. **Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.

4. **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.