

Strengthening national capacity for implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Argentina

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12348
Countries
Argentina
Project Name
Strengthening national capacity for implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Argentina
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
5/20/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Saba Kalam
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments
6/4/2026

Cleared

6/2/2026

The title of the project and the title of the LoE are still not matching. I understand, I had earlier suggested to include CBIT-2 in the title but that is making it inconsistent with the LoE title. Please remove "(Argentina CBIT 2)" from the title.



**Secretaría de
Turismo y Ambiente**
Jefatura de Gabinete de Ministros

**Subsecretaría
de Ambiente**

To: Ersin Esen
GEF Executive Coordinator
United Nations Environment Programme

Subject: Endorsement for Strengthening national capacity for implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Argentina.

General Project Information

Project Title

Strengthening national capacity for implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Argentina (Argentina CBIT2)

5/20/2026

1. Please change the "project Sector" to Mixed & Others.
2. Insert GEF Agency ID.
3. Please make the title of the project consistent with the LOE title.

Agency's Comments
2026-06-03

The abbreviation "(Argentina CBIT2)" was removed from the title in the Project title field in the Platform for a complete match with the LoE.

Additionally, yellow highlights were removed.

Lastly, the Agency ID # was added.

2026-06-01

The project sector was adjusted to Mixed & others. The project title is now consistent with the LoE. UNEP's ID hasn't been assigned yet and will be added during the PPG phase as soon as it is assigned.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

5/20/2026

In the summary, please briefly mention the remaining gaps and barriers the project intends to address to comply with the ETF.

Agency's Comments

2026-06-01

A reference was added in the Project Summary to briefly describe the main gaps and barriers the project intends to address in order to comply with the ETF, covering GHG inventory methodological limitations, adaptation monitoring, NDC tracking, SNICC integration, and climate finance tracking.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared.

As the CBIT Set-Aside had been fully utilized, this project was previously submitted to the GEF in anticipation of additional resources becoming available. The GEF reviewed the project offline and provided several suggestions. The agency has since addressed all comments and submitted the revised version through the portal. In the current version, all comments raised during the offline review appear to have been adequately addressed.

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

5/20/2026

- There's scope to better capture gender dimensions in Outputs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 3.2. Please amend.
- All lessons learned from each output will be compiled into a book / Project Memoir, as part of the project's Knowledge Management Strategy.
- M&E cost is 5.1% of the project cost, is considered okay.

Agency's Comments

2026-06-01

Gender references have been incorporated into Outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 3.2, focusing on deliverables that will identify gender-related information gaps and define targeted strategies and plans to address them.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. PMC is 10% and co-financing is 14% of the total project cost. Considering this is a CBIT project, co-financing seems okay. Co-financing in the PMC is nearly 61% of the total project co-financing.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared. The current situation is clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective, providing a coherent and evidence-based narrative that links the country's underlying institutional, technical, and financial capacity constraints that impede its ability to fulfill its transparency obligations under the Paris Agreement. The project has taken into account the learning and the outcomes of the CBIT-1 project.

Agency's Comments
4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared. The agency is requested to further elaborate the analysis of the need to have a CBIT phase 2 project by filling up the need assessment table at the PPG stage.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Gaps related to capacity identified in previous FSV/ICA/TER/ information sharing/exchange of views process of last 2-3 reports	Gaps identified during stakeholder consultation (Group or individual including requests from the Government on capacity required to comply with ETF)	Gaps addressed by CBIT 1 or activities of any other agency like ICAT/PATPA/etc.	Gaps identified in Terminal Evaluation of CBIT-1 related to building further capacity in specific areas (if any)	Gaps to be addressed by CBIT 2	Map relevant output of CBIT -2, proposed to address the gaps (mentioned in column 5)

Institutional Coordination						
MRV/GHG Accounting						
MPGs/CRTs/CTFs						
NDCs						
FTC, Adaptation						
Other						

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. The project has a clear and well-articulated ToC that maps out the causal pathways and logical linkages through which mobilized inputs are expected to generate quantifiable outputs and measurable outcomes, ultimately contributing to long-term transformational impact.

The ToC is aligned with the ETF under Article 13 of the PA, ensuring that anticipated results are structured to support robust MRV, thereby enabling effective tracking of progress against NDCs and facilitating evidence-based adaptive management throughout the project lifecycle.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. The project will be executed by UNDP. Details of potential coordination provided including with ICAT; Umbrella programme to prepare and submit BTRs and NCs; NDC partnership.

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. Yes, the core indicators identified in the project results framework are calculated in full conformity with the methodological guidance established under the GEF Results.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

5/20/2026

- In Institutional and Policy risk, please include staff turnover and how the project will ensure capacity to be retained.

- Execution risk around the IT module development should be flagged. The software development and system integration carry delivery risk that is not currently reflected.

Agency's Comments

2026-06-01

The Risks table was updated in two entries: the Institutional and Policy risk was expanded to include staff turnover as an additional risk factor and knowledge management as a mitigation measure; and the Technological risk entry was revised to flag delivery risks associated with IT module development and system integration, along with corresponding mitigation measures.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside. The proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. The project demonstrates strong alignment with the country's reporting commitments under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, which establishes the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) requiring Parties to regularly submit national inventory reports and information necessary to track progress towards their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), support received and provided.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

5/20/2026

In the Policy Requirements section, please answer the two- Indigenous people and private sector.

Were the following stakeholders consulted during project identification phase:

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities:

Civil Society Organizations: Yes

Private Sector:

Agency's Comments

2026-05-01

Regarding the selection of stakeholders in the Policy Requirements section, the Portal only allows to select the positive consultations, but there is no option to discard specific stakeholders.

D. POLICY REQUIREMENTS

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment ⓘ

We confirm that gender dimensions relevant to the project have been addressed as per GEF Policy and are clearly articulated in the Project Description (Section B).

☒ Yes ☐ No (provide comments)

Stakeholder Engagement ⓘ

We confirm that key stakeholders were consulted during PIF development as required per GEF policy, their relevant roles to project outcomes and plan to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO endorsement has been clearly articulated in the Project Description (Section B).

☒ Yes ☐ No (provide comments)

Were the following stakeholders consulted during project identification phase:

- ☐ Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- ☒ Civil Society Organizations
- ☐ Private Sector

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. The process began with an internal workshop to review lessons from CBIT 1 and define priorities for Phase 2. It highlighted the need for a more integrated system design with stronger module functionality and more user-friendly outputs. The project was then presented to the Focal Points Working Group, which reviewed activities on GHG inventories, NDC tracking, adaptation, and support received. The group endorsed the technical direction and recommended ad hoc working groups on data integration, QA/QC, and gender responsiveness.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

5/20/2026

The total co-financing indicated is \$280,000 whereas the indicative co-financing section is empty. The agency is requested to complete this section.

Indicative Co-financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Total Co-financing				0.00

Agency's Comments
2026-06-01

Co-financing table in the specific sections was completed.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside. The proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside. The proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. The PPG requested is within the allowable cap as established under GEF policies and guidelines for the relevant project category and grant size.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

Cleared. The proposed GEF financing, inclusive of the Agency fee, is fully in line with applicable GEF policies, guidelines, and established financial parameters. The total project financing requested from the GEF Trust Fund will be funded through CCM CBIT Set-Aside resources. The Agency fee, calculated in accordance with the GEF's standardized fee structure, falls within the permissible range as stipulated in GEF policy.

The agency is requested to fill the co-financing section in the PIF as mentioned above and provide co-financing letter at the PPG stage.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

5/20/2026

The project has been endorsed by Paula Montenegro, OFP since March 2026. The letter has been signed digitally. OP to confirm if this is acceptable.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared. Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

The letter has been signed digitally. OP to confirm if this is acceptable.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared. Map included

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

6/2/2026

Cleared

5/20/2026

- The attached SRIF does not include the Safeguards team review and their signature. Please provide complete SRIF.

Agency's Comments
2026-06-01

A new SRIF was attached after Safeguards team review and now includes their signature.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
5/20/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/23/2026	6/1/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/4/2026	6/3/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		