



Ecosystem restoration in seven national protected areas of Argentina

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11490

Countries

Argentina

Project Name

Ecosystem restoration in seven national protected areas of Argentina

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

12/20/2023

Review completed by PM

3/27/2024

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Please move the gender section into the right part of the PIF. Currently it is in the section on stakeholder participation.

Please reflect gender perspectives in: Outputs 1.1.1 (strategic guidelines), 1.1.3 (financing mechanism) as well as 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 3.1.3. As a good gender mainstreaming practice, Agency is requested to include in the Indicative Project Overview table, references to gender that were included in the component descriptions.

Please consistently include women among the project stakeholders given that more than 50% of the project beneficiaries are women.

2/6/2024

As noted in the January 8 review above, please reflect gender perspectives in: Outputs 1.1.1 (strategic guidelines), 1.1.3 (financing mechanism) as well as 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 3.1.3. As a good gender mainstreaming practice, Agency is requested to include in the Indicative Project Overview table, references to gender that were included in the component descriptions.

Please consistently include women among the project stakeholders given that more than 50% of the project beneficiaries are women.

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

Moved. The pertinent text was moved to D. POLICY REQUIREMENTS. **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.**

20/03/2024

Gender perspectives were included in the outputs and highlighted for your review.

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared for a-c.

The project has provided details on consultations during PIF design and outlined plans for engagement with key stakeholder in project development. In the section on stakeholder engagement the PIF references an Annex 2 but this Annex does not seem to be included in the submission. Please include.

2/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

The document Annex 2 has been included in the gef portal- roadmap section.

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Please note that in the section on coordination with other initiatives is the text on how the core indicators were estimated. Please delete this text from this section and include text on the entire suite of issues related to the implementation framework above and when the revision is resubmitted this section will be evaluated.

2/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

The text was replaced in section **Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects**

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

1/8/2024

Please include an estimate for Core Indicator 6.

2/6/2024

The project includes as one of its core indicators the improvement management of 1,106,601 hectares of protected areas as a result of a variety of interventions, including fire management. This will create benefits to be measured through Core Indicator 6 based on the ecosystems in these hectares. Please include an estimate for Core Indicator 6.

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

The mitigation of greenhouse emissions will be a co-benefit of the project. The restoration actions to be implemented will contribute to carbon sequestration in the long-term. However, during project implementation the changes in carbon sequestered will be minimal and probably quite difficult to measure. In fact, some interventions most probably will generate, in the short-term, net emissions until the restored system matures. Therefore, it is not advisable to include a target for the Core Indicator 6.

20/03/2024

The estimated total green house emissions mitigated will be 2.010.943 metric tons of CO2e of carbon sequestration and avoided emissions over 20 years (accounting period), starting in 2030 (start year of accounting), after project completion. This value was estimated using the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool.

This data was estimated with experts of National Parks of Argentina and included in the PIF.

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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 Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A
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
1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A
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
1/8/2024

Recurrent expenses should be labeled as "in-kind."

Please explain what entity is contributing that you have labeled "other".

Please clarify the source of the UNDP cofinance. Please note that existing GEF projects can not be a source of cofinance for future GEF projects.

3/27/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

The contribution of Recipient Country Government has been listed as in-kind.

The "others" refer to contributions from local communities, private sector and local NGOs. An explanatory text has been added.

The explanation of the UNDP co-financing was expanded. The UNDP project name is "Strengthening the capacities of the National Parks Administration" (PNUD ARG/23/004) which is funded by the National Treasure.

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

The LoE presents the project's title (Ecosystem restoration in seven national protected areas of Argentina) is slightly different than the title in Portal (Ecosystem restoration in national protected areas of Argentina). Please include the same title in Portal to match that in LoE.

4/1/2024

The title in the LOE remains the same (see screenshot below) ? please either get a new LoE with the updated title, change the title in Portal reflecting the title in LoE (note: considering that the title can be modified later, it might be easier to change the title in Portal).

República Argentina - Poder Ejecutivo Nacional
AÑO DE LA DEFENSA DE LA VIDA, LA LIBERTAD Y LA PROPIEDAD

Nota

Número: NO-2024-11860211-APN-SSA#MI

CIUDAD DE BUENOS AIRES

Jueves 1 de Febrero de 2024

Referencia: Endorsement for GEF 8 Project "Ecosystem restoration in seven national protected areas of Argentina.

A: Mr. Ignacio Lorenzo Arana (CAF),

Con Copia A: EZEQUIEL MARTIN LANDABURO (DGA#APNAC), Raúl Chiesa (VPD#APNAC),

De mi mayor consideración:

Mr. Ignacio Lorenzo Arana
GEF Project Coordinator (CAF)
Director of Biodiversity and Climate Advise
Development Bank of Latin America and the Caribbean (CAF)

4/7/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

The Letter of Endorsement has been updated and its title has been corrected.

04/01/2024

The title has been changed in the GEF-portal. It is now: "Ecosystem restoration in seven national protected areas of Argentina"

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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 Comments

1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

Yes. Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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 Comments

1/8/2024

NA

Agency's CommentsN/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

1/8/2024

No, please address issues above and resubmit.

2/6/2024

No, as not all issues raised in the first review have been addressed. Please revise accordingly and resubmit.

4/1/2024

The title in the LOE remains the same (see screenshot pasted above) ? please either get a new LoE with the updated title, change the title in Portal reflecting the title in LoE (note: considering that the title can be modified later, it might be easier to change the title in Portal).

4/1/2024

Yes, PIF is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Agency's Comments

02/05/2024

The PIF has attended the comments of the PM and has been resubmitted.

20/03/2024

The team has attended the comments of the PM and has been resubmitted.

04/01/2024

The Title has been modified and it matches with the LoE.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N/A

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| First Review | 1/17/2024 | 1/8/2024 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 2/6/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/27/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/1/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

