

Integrated low-carbon and conservation investments in Argentinian cities

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10466

Countries

Argentina

Project Name

Integrated low-carbon and conservation investments in Argentinian cities

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/16/2021

Review completed by PM

10/28/2021

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

No. While there is excellent focus of the project in developing integrated spatial plans in target cities and providing specific investment to demonstrate integrated solutions, the project will benefit from technical assistance to strengthen urban governance within cities and greater coordination between national and city governments for planning and implementing the solutions and financial mechanisms. We recommend that a specific activity related to urban governance strengthening be added in the project which will ensure long term sustainability and replicability of the outcomes.

PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared, with further request. The current implementation start date is 10/15/2021. Kindly revise the implementation start date to a later date to provide ample time to incorporate latest updates and undergo GEF internal clearance and approval process.

-

PM 9/21/2021:

Cleared.

PM 9/27/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- **On Table B** you have added a "Monitoring and Evaluation" Component at the end of the table. You can either incorporate M&E activities under other components (this is the most common way in other projects) or have them as a separate component in which case you have to add the number of the component (i.e. Component 5) and fill out the empty columns (i.e. financing type and expected outcomes).

- **Budget.** As per GEF guidelines, PMU staff which is part of the executing unit must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion of the PMC. This project has co-financing resources of 8.7 million dollars on top of the 1.1 million dollars from the GEF. This could cover the costs associated with the project's execution, including all the positions that are partially covered by the project's components:

- Biodiversity Coordinator
- Chief Project Coordinator
- Communication specialist
- Economics and Financial Mechanisms Coordinator
- Energy, Transport and other Mitigation Coordinator
- Gender, Community Engagement and Safeguards Specialist
- Platforms, Capacity-building and Participation Coordinator
- Urban Planning Coordinator

-

•There are some project staff not charged to PMC at all:

- Deputy Project Coordinators

-

•There are some budget lines that have no explanation, but are charged to the PMC.

Please provide an explanation for these.

- Events (4 in total)
- Travel ? institutional
- Travel ? international
- Travel ? technical

PM 10/28/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

We share the reviewer's view on the importance of strengthening urban governance, with indicator 1C of the results framework (annex A), highlighting the centrality of strengthening urban governance in the project: # of metropolitan areas with enhanced interjurisdictional cooperation on integrated planning.

Technical assistance to support the achievement of this indicator and strengthen urban governance is covered through deliverables at the pilot city level. The key deliverables are 1.1.5, 1.2.4 (ix), 1.4.5, 1.5.4 (ix), 1.7.5, 1.8.4(vi), 1.10.5, 1.11.4(ix) and 1.12.4(iv). Furthermore, we have added new deliverables, 1.5.8, 1.5.9, 1.8.8 and 1.8.9, to further strengthen urban governance in the metropolitan areas of Mendoza and Salta (deliverables 1.5.9 and 1.8.9 previously existed in different outputs but were moved here and enhanced).

To enhance the strengthening of urban government through-out the country, outputs 4.1 and 4.2 have been revised to have a greater and direct focus on urban governance strengthening. Please refer to the revised texts of these outputs.

To facilitate the successful execution of the above outputs and deliverables, and to achieve the indicator, as part of the institutional arrangements there will be a working group dedicated to this issue (TWG1). TWG1 will facilitate the engagement of stakeholders and interaction among participating cities for, inter alia, strengthening metropolitan planning processes and urban governance. It will serve as a participatory channel for deliberation on urban planning and governance in Argentina. Text has been added to this working group's description to ensure a greater focus on urban governance strengthening, section 6 (institutional arrangements).

09/16/2021

Implementation start date changed to 12/15/2021.

• **10/22/2021**

1. Regarding table B, the GEFSEC raised this issue on 12/21/2020 in the review sheet for the project 10284: Accelerating the transition to electric public transport in the Greater Metropolitan Area of Costa Rica. Upon receiving the comment, UNEP and the GEFSEC held a virtual meeting on 7 January 2021 where it was agreed that it was acceptable to have M&E separated as displayed in that project (and this project), i.e. without component number, financing type, outcome description and outputs. This structure was used for UNEP GEF projects that the GEF CEO has endorsed since then, including:

- ? 10277 ? Chile electric mobility
- ? 10281 ? Antigua and Barbuda electric mobility
- ? 10283 ? Saint Lucia electric mobility
- ? 10284 ? Costa Rica electric mobility
- ? 10342 ? Paraguay CBIT
- ? 10427 ? Bahamas CBIT

•? 10596 ? Trinidad and Tobago CBIT

Based on this previous guidance, table B has been kept as is.

2. On the budget

Thanks for the comment. The use of the term PMU (Project management unit) is misleading. As per the terms of reference (see annex K), most of the unit's individuals have primarily technical roles, with additional minor project management functions. Where an individual has a management and a technical role, the budget has been split accordingly between PMC and the components.

To address the GEFSEC's comment, the term PMU has been changed to 'Project Team' through-out the document to eliminate confusion. Creating such a team is important for ensuring coordination between the different technical and management personnel of this large and complex project. Such coordination will play a key role in ensuring efficient project delivery.

On the Deputy Project Coordinators, they are actually primarily charged to PMC (see page 233 of the project document, annex I-1, line 110102 (below the Chief Project Coordinator in PMC)). They also have a technical function, as per their TOR (see page 246). The TOR has been updated to make it clearer.

Explanation on the PMC travel and events lines has been added to the final page of annex K (page 331) of the project document.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. The supporting evidence of co-financing has been uploaded in the system. However, in the co-financing provided by Government of Buenos Aires City there is an inconsistency between the category in the co-financing letter and the category in Table C of the portal document. For instance, according to the co-financing letter the Government of Buenos Aires has provided \$11 million in investment mobilized and \$13.5 million in recurrent expenses, while the portal document states \$11 million in recurrent expenses and \$13.5 million in investment mobilized. Please correct the document in the portal accordingly. The same applies to the municipalities of Mar de Plata, Mendoza, Salta and Ushuaia.

•2. The project proposes a number of activities which can mobilize investments and co-finance from private sector e.g. sustainable tourism, energy, etc. To the extent possible, and in line with comments from the Council during the PFD approval, please consider exploring co-finance from private sector.

•

•3. In the baseline, the project lists a number of national level projects funded by IADB and World Bank. We are wondering whether the project should consider identifying the most recent ones as possible co-finance for this project.

PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Portal and CEO has been corrected.

2. The private sector will play a key role in the project, as described in the alternative scenario and private sector engagement sections (section 1b.3 and section 4). With the project being multi-focal, covering five cities and a plethora of sectors, the private sector will engage in a multitude of different activities, from street infrastructure to bicycle renting, from waste management to sustainable tourism. The private sector was consulted during the project development grant phase (see stakeholders consulted, annex S) and identified as key stakeholders during project execution (see section 2 on stakeholders). Private sector co-financing was considered during the PPG phase but was difficult to materialize at this stage of the project. This is due to the following factors:

a. There was a desire in the project design phase not to predetermine which private sector actors would participate in project execution activities. There is significant interest within the pilot cities on realizing the local project activities; in this sense, it was identified that it would be preferable to hold open tenders for private sector participation based on detailed terms of reference, rather than pre-execution identification through co-financing commitments. This will ensure a competitive and transparent process for selecting private sector actor participation in project activities. It will also lead to greater leveraging, through more precise identification of the private

sector actors that share the same interests as the project. Ultimately, the project aims to develop an enabling environment for broad and deep private sector engagement through-out the project's duration and beyond;

b. The economic situation and recent economic history in Argentina and the nature of the private sector actors, primarily small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), led to a hesitance among such actors to provide co-financing letters of commitment. This was due to difficulties in such actors being able to effectively estimate investment opportunities in the medium- to long-term in the context of projected ongoing national and provincial macro-economic instability;

c. Building on the previous factor, the innovative nature of the project's interventions, with little or no previous national experiences in such, led to a further barrier to private sector commitment of co-financing.

Factors b and c align with the GEF Council's comments on the PFD which identified challenges in obtaining private sector co-financing, noting "that it involves long-term investment with significantly complex interactions between sectors and without a standardized measurement, hence difficult for investors to measure the anticipated impact, and hence make decisions based on anticipated impact."

The Council further notes: "Is the objective with the "innovative finance" above to increase the amount of private investment leveraged or to be innovative with existing public finance available?"

In the context of the above factors, and building upon the GEF Council's PFD comments, the project aims to be innovative with existing public finance available and increase the amount of private investment leveraged. Component 3 focuses directly on this. On innovative public financing, the Bank of Investment and Foreign Trade (BICE), which has committed co-financing, will play a key role as it has various credit lines available to SMEs for catalysing their participation in sustainable development (including through a GCF project). The GEF project will work to enhance and strengthen these innovative public financing mechanisms to focus on catalysing private sector investment in sustainable urban development. On leveraging private investment, the project has a dedicated working group on financial instruments and scaling-up (TWG3), which will play a key role in ensuring the success of component 3. The description of this working group has been revised to ensure that it more directly focuses on identifying how the project can leverage private sector investment (see section 6).

3. On co-financing from public financial institutions, in the case of Ushuaia, Salta and Mendoza local interventions of national projects funded by IADB and the World Bank are included in the co-financing commitments of the local governments (see for instance the co-financing letter of Ushuaia with regards to IADB support for the treatment of solid urban waste). At the national level, the GEF project aims to build upon and establish synergies with IADB and World Bank national investments through the active involvement of the Ministry of Public Works (which has committed co-financing) and

the Ministry of Spatial Development and Habitat. These ministries, which run national programmes which draw on the IADB and World Bank national investments, will be members of the project steering committee and the thematic working groups (including the working group on institutional integration).

Furthermore, significant public finance sector co-financing was obtained for the project through a commitment of USD 50 million from the Bank of Investment and Foreign Trade (BICE). It was the preference of the Government of Argentina to draw on co-financing of national public financial institutions rather than international public financial institutions to:

- i. Build the national capacity of such institutions on innovative public financing for sustainable urban development;
- ii. Work with national institutions that correspondingly have deeper and broader knowledge of financing local interventions than international institutions;
- iii. Ensure the long-term sustainability of the project's interventions through the participation of actors that are embedded within the national public financial architecture.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

PM 9/27/2021:

Yes but with comments. GEF PPG resources are not meant to cover miscellaneous (i.e. bank charges) expenses, even during the preparation phase. Please update Annex C accordingly.

PM 10/28/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response **10/22/2021.** Annex C has been updated accordingly. It has been also updated with the latest information on expenditures.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Explain in the document why the hectares of terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use has been decrease from more than 800,000 ha at PFD to less than 200,000 ha at CEO Endorsement.
- Provide a spreadsheet with an estimation on the GHG mitigated.

PM 9/15/2021:

1. Cleared.

2. No. Please address the following comments:

- The Agency ProDoc has been updated accordingly but the CEO Endorsement document still show 6,118,754. Please update.
- Additionally, there is an inconsistency in the total amount of GHG (direct+indirect) between Tab "Summary 1" which reports 6,131,489 tons and Tab "Summary 2" which

reports 5,970,267 tons. The error comes from cell D42 in Tab "Summary 2" which shall report 161,220 tons. Please update accordingly.

The screenshot shows two versions of the same Excel spreadsheet. The top version shows the 'Summary_1' tab with the following data:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
31		CABA	0	154,534	154,534	0	154,534			
32		Other Cities	0	483,661	483,661	410,784	894,445			
33		TOTAL WASTE MNG	189,862	1,999,880	2,189,742	410,784	2,600,526			

The bottom version shows the 'Summary_2' tab with the following data:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
31		CABA	0	154,534	154,534	0	154,534			
32		Other Cities	0	483,661	483,661	410,784	894,445			
33		TOTAL WASTE MNG	189,862	1,999,880	2,189,742	410,784	2,600,526			
35	ENERGY									
36		[Tons CO _{2e}]	Direct, Pilots	Direct, Post-Project, Top-down	Direct, total	Indirect	Total (20 years)			
37		Salta	1,166	10,786	11,952	0	11,952			
38		Ushuaia	7,670	184,379	192,049	0	192,049			
39		Mendoza	893	10,649	11,542	0	11,542			
40		Mar del Plata	275	0	275	0	275			
41		CABA	0	61,814	61,814	0	61,814			
42		Other Cities	0	0	0	986,775	986,775			
43		TOTAL ENERGY	10,004	267,627	277,631	986,775	1,264,406			

PM 9/21/2021:
Cleared.

Agency Response

1. As summarized in Table 2 of the CEO Endorsement document, "Changes to core indicators", the discrepancy is due almost entirely to a numerical mistake made at the time the Concept Note was being finalized, in which the area of Tierra del Fuego National Park was mistakenly transcribed as 689,100 ha, rather than its actual area, which is 68,909 ha. In other words, an extra zero was added in the PFD, which threw off the total by some 620,000 ha. We regret this unfortunate error at the time of PFD finalization.

Additional minor recalculations of PA areas, along with the inclusion of four additional, quite small urban protected areas, complete the changes. Mar Chiquita PAs in Mar del Plata were reduced from 3 to 1 as there was considerable overlap in their territories and project actions will be focused on the Biosphere Reserve (see Annex F, Indicator 1.2, for the revised set of PAs). The table below provides the PA-level figures as per the PFD and as revised in the CEO document.

Name	Child project doc PA areas (ha)	ProDoc PA areas (ha)
Bahia Encerrada	-	32
PN Baritu	87,831	72,436
RN El Nogalar de los Toldos		3,275
Laguna de Pintascayo		14,467
Finca Las Costas	10,259	10,514
Laguna de los Padres	-	695
PN Tierra del Fuego	689,100	68,909
Cerro San Bernardo	240	100
Divisadero Largo	-	492
Chiquito / Chiquita	79,570	26,488
Lago Lugano	-	35
TOTALS	867,000	197,443

2. The GHG spreadsheet has been uploaded to the portal. In reviewing the spreadsheet we found some minor errors in the file. This resulted in a slight increase in the projected total emission reductions (increasing from 6,118,754 tons to 6,131,489 tons). The CEO document, including Annex M, has been updated accordingly.

09/16/2021

1. The total estimated GHG emission reductions has been checked and updated in all locations.
2. Spreadsheet has been corrected and a new version uploaded to the portal.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
PM 7/15/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Outcome 1: The creation of online data platform for integrated geo-spatial planning is a welcome initiative and will be catalytic. In addition to relevant urban data, the platform should also consider overlaying climate data available from national and international

resources (e.g. NASA, ESA or World Bank) as it will inform climate resilient planning. Please also elaborate if these data platforms will be interlinked through one system and whether it will be connected at national level for wider replication.

-

- Outcome 2: The focus on circular economy in a couple of cities is welcome and will be an excellent contribution at the programmatic level. However, the circularity approach seems to be focused only on solid waste management whereas circularity approach goes beyond this to include resource efficiency (e.g. sustainable, renewable materials) to deliver multiple benefits of climate, nature and pollution reduction. Please elaborate if the project will adopt a broader approach or just a solid waste management support. The circularity approach also provides a good opportunity for the project to deliver benefits related to plastic waste reduction and reduction of harmful chemicals. Tapping this opportunity will enable the project to contribute to GEF's chemicals and waste focal area outcomes too as a co-benefit.

PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Outcome 1

- Overlaying of climate data. Thanks for this suggestion. Text was added to outputs 1.1, 1.4, 1.7 and 1.10 (see the tables in each of these outputs) to ensure that the local platforms also overlay climate data available through existing national and international resources where possible;
- Connectivity. The local platforms will be part of the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (Infraestructura de Datos Espaciales, IDERA, <https://mapa.idera.gob.ar>), connecting in one integral system with existing provincial GIS and national GIS platforms. See existing text under outputs 1.1, 1.4, 1.7 and 1.10 (see the tables in these sections, row: ?Connected to?). In this way, the GIS data of all local platforms will be interlinked through an existing national data framework. Furthermore, the local platforms will be connected to the national platform established under output 4.1 to facilitate the sharing of experiences, good practices and lessons learned. Text has been added to each of the tables of these outputs to clarify this. See also existing text under output 4.1.

Outcome 2

The project does seek to promote a broader circularity approach beyond solid waste management. While a direct focus on material production is beyond the project's scope, the project actively seeks to promote circularity and life-cycle thinking through the development of local circuits. This is primarily with regards to food and waste, for example in Mendoza (output 2.3), Salta (outputs 2.5 and 2.6) and Ushuaia (output 2.8). To enhance the focus on resource efficient production, text has been added to deliverables 2.6.2 and 2.8.2. More broadly, under component 1 integrated plans will promote circular economy principles and thinking covering all stages of the lifecycle. This is particularly the focus in output 1.5 (adoption of a circular economy in the

Mendoza sustainable city block), output 1.8 (promotion of circular economies along the Salta corridors) and output 1.12 (encouraging circular economy practices in vulnerable neighborhoods). While possible co-benefits due to chemicals and waste are not captured in the project document, we look forward to reporting on these during project execution through the project implementation review reports.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes, with request for clarification. On sustainability, please indicate how will the digital platforms be resourced after GEF funding is exhausted? Will these be housed in city departments which will continue to fund them?

•

9/15/2021 PM:

Cleared.

Agency Response City departments will house and fund the ongoing maintenance, operation and enhancement of the city digital platforms. In the cases of Mar del Plata, Mendoza and Salta, the platforms will build upon existing platforms which have existing management structures. As the project will expand the reach and scope of the platforms, it will also support the cities to develop protocols for the enhanced platform governance, information exchange and usage. Text has been added to deliverables of outputs 1.1, 1.4, 1.7 and 1.10 to clarify the ongoing responsibilities for post-project maintenance, operation and enhancement.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes, with request for clarification. Please, when possible translate into English the
name of the stakeholders consulted.

PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response Done ? the section has been translated.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender
differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,
does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators
and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes, with request for clarification. Please incorporate in the project document of the
GEF portal a summary of the proposed action plan and main activities.

PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response Done ? a summary has been placed in the GEF portal.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes, with further suggestions. The implementation arrangement looks fine with clear role of cities in project execution through the Local Advisory Groups. Under the functions of the LAGs, it would be good to include their role in core execution activities such as urban planning, designing of solutions, etc. This will ensure stronger ownership as well their capacity building. Just an advisory function may not deliver expected outcomes at the local level and will avoid the perception that this is a top-down program.

•PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response Thank you for these suggestions. Text was added to section 6 (institutional arrangements and coordination) to make clear the LAG's role in core execution activities.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

PM 9/27/2021:

No. In table under Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" the sum of all the expenses stipulated in the M&E budget do not equal 250k. Please review and include all the figures even if they are part of CPC and PMU budget.

PM 10/28/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response **10/22/2021**. Table in section 9 of the portal (and annex J of the UNEP project document) has been updated accordingly.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes, with further suggestions. Economic and social benefits are articulated well. The project may also look at potential health benefits from urban greening which can be linked with green and resilient recovery. Also, the project will likely have a significant climate resilience benefits which could be elaborated and linked with activities such as resilient transportation and nature based solutions under BD component. If yes, it could be highlighted in this section and across the document with a possible tagging of CCA Rio Marker as 1.

-

PM 9/15/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Identification of the potential health benefits is noted under the social benefits section.

A sub-section on climate resilience benefits, including its connection to nature-based solutions (NbS), has been added to Section 10. Benefits (p. 183). A definition of NBS, with select references, has been added as footnote #11 (p.19). The importance and need for NBS has been highlighted in city profiles, including: the City of Buenos Aires (CABA) (p.45), Mar del Plata (p.49); Mendoza (p.56); Salta (p.62), and; Ushuaia (p.66). Finally, a summary of the links between the NbS concept and the BD and LD components of the project is presented on p. 69-70. The CCA Rio Marker has been tagged in the document and the portal.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

PM 11/03/2021:

No. Please address the following comments in Annex E Budget:

1) Since there are enough co-financing funds allocated to PMC, and in line with the Guidelines, please note there are two positions that shall be fully charged to PMC: Chief

Project Coordinator and Deputy Project Coordinators (more than one person). Please update the budget accordingly.
2) Please add a summarized explanation of PMC travel and events in the Budget table.

PM 11/05/2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

11/04/2021:

1) The budget has been updated accordingly, with the Chief Project Coordinator and the Deputy Project Coordinators fully charged to PMC. Budget for the Communication Specialist and the Economics and Financial Mechanisms Coordinator has been removed from PMC and allocated to the project outputs, as these consultants will not have project management functions.

2) Explanations of PMC travel and events have been added to the budget table.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/15/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 7/15/2021:

N/A.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

PM 9/15/2021:

The GEF SEC is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address additional comments/requests for clarifications, i.e. update start implementation date and fix some inconsistencies in the GHG figures.

PM 9/21/2021:

The CEO Endorsement of this project is recommended for technical clearance.

PM 9/27/2021:

No. Please address the following additional comments:

- On Table B you have added a "Monitoring and Evaluation" Component at the end of the table. You can either incorporate M&E activities under other components (this is the most common way in other projects) or have them as a separate component in which case you have to add the number of the component (i.e. Component 5) and fill out the empty columns (i.e. financing type and expected outcomes).

- In table under Section 9 "Monitoring and Evaluation" the sum of all the expenses stipulated in the M&E budget do not equal 250k. Please review and include all the figures even if they are part of CPC and PMU budget.

- GEF PPG resources are not meant to cover miscellaneous (i.e. bank charges) expenses, even during the preparation phase. Please update Annex C accordingly.

- Budget. As per GEF guidelines, PMU staff which is part of the executing unit must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion of the PMC. This project has co-financing resources of 8.7 million dollars on top of the 1.1 million dollars from the GEF. This could cover the costs associated with the project's execution, including all the positions that are partially covered by the project's components:

- Biodiversity Coordinator
- Chief Project Coordinator
- Communication specialist
- Economics and Financial Mechanisms Coordinator
- Energy, Transport and other Mitigation Coordinator
- Gender, Community Engagement and Safeguards Specialist
- Platforms, Capacity-building and Participation Coordinator
- Urban Planning Coordinator

•

•There are some project staff not charged to PMC at all:

- Deputy Project Coordinators

•

•There are some budget lines that have no explanation, but are charged to the PMC.

Please provide an explanation for these.

- Events (4 in total)
- Travel ? institutional
- Travel ? international
- Travel ? technical

PM 11/03/2021:

No. Please address the following comments:

1) Since there are enough co-financing funds allocated to PMC, and in line with the Guidelines, please note there are two positions that shall be fully charged to PMC: Chief Project Coordinator and Deputy Project Coordinators (more than one person). Please update the budget accordingly.

2) Please add a summarized explanation of PMC travel and events in the Budget table.

PM 11/05/2021:

Cleared.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations