

Integrated water resources management in the transboundary Bermejo River Basin

Basic Information

GEF ID

10995

Countries

Regional (Argentina, Bolivia)

Project Title

Integrated water resources management in the transboundary Bermejo River Basin

GEF Agency(ies)

CAF

Agency ID

CAF: CAF-GEF 038

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes. But please address and note the following:

(1) OAS is identified as the lead executing entity for this project. In the Project Information section, only OAS should show as Executing Partner. Please revise accordingly.

(2) The PIF requires substantial additional inputs to bring it to the requisite standard. Given the GEF ID 10554 (Pantanal) PIF contains similar project elements (anchored by the TDA-SAP process), please consider taking cues from it in terms of structure and substance, including level of detail required. This comment is reflected throughout the review sheet.

(3) Please ensure the PIF submission follows the PIF template numbering and order.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): No

(1) If all Executing Partners are listed, please change Executing Partner Type to "Other". OAS is listed as the sole EA in the word version of the PIF uploaded to the portal, but OAS, COBINABE, COREBE, OTNPB are listed in the portal submission.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) OAS was identified as Executing Partner.

2) done.

3) done

5/ 2011E.

17/05/2022

1) Done.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) Please revise the objective to "To reverse present land and water degradation trends in the binational Bermejo Basin by introducing integrated water resources management approaches, including to groundwater resources, revamping and consolidating existing transboundary cooperation mechanisms, and accelerating priority reforms and investments."

(2) The project component titles do not sufficiently capture the essence of what each component will set out to do and achieve. Please recast each component title accordingly.

(3) Please simplify the project outputs listed in Table B. Each output should be a concise single sentence. Please remove footnotes and cover these references elsewhere in the document.

(4) The project outcomes and outputs are not written as true project outcomes and outputs. Please see the GEF ID 10554 PIF for guidance.

(5) The logic of how each output contributes to its mapped outcome must be better explained in the Alternative Scenario section. Only then can a full assessment of Table B be made.

(6) The project must include tangible on-the-ground benefits with clear transboundary relevance. Please consider revamping Table B to include outputs leading to demonstrated on the ground benefits of and stress reduction from environmentally sound and cost effective approaches and technologies for replication in the SAP. These outputs should be demonstrations/pilots of the possible reforms and investments outlined under Output 3.2 in Table B.

(7) The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$44,800,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be \$2,400,000 instead of \$1,500,000 (which is 3.35%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the

GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level.

(8) Please strengthen Output 3.2 with "SAP signed at the ministerial level", rather than "will be submitted to countries for endorsement at the ministerial level". Add "Strategic Action Programme" to outcome 3.

(9) Please ensure outputs are quantified where possible.

(10) Please include an output on setting up inter-ministerial committees to inform SAP implementation and long-term buy-in.

(11) Please consider adding a Component 5: M&E to Table B. This will ensure that Table B and the budget table in the CEO Endorsement document can be harmonized.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done

2) Done

3) Done

4) Done

5) Done

6) Following the recommendations of the TE of the previous IW SAP implementation project, the countries and the implementing agency excluded pilot demonstrations, since useful lessons learned could be drawn from the large number of them already implemented in the previous GEF IW project. The focus of the proposed project is instead on consolidating and expanding transboundary cooperation, and accelerating priority investments and reforms. These are tangible results and key objectives of the IW focal area.

7) The co-financing contribution to PMC was corrected in the PIF.

8) Done

9) The only quantifiable output appears to be the training modules, whose number will be defined during PPG.

10) Done. See Component 1 description.

11) Not feasible at this point in time. Will be done as part of the PPG.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please include co-financing from CAF, COBINABE, COREBE and OTNPB.

(2) Please further detail how the investment mobilized (\$39M) pertains to the proposed project. This is not sufficiently clear in the description field.

(3) Please explain action taken to secure private enterprise co-financing and what the prospects are for further co-financing secured during PPG.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) CAF co-financing was included; Co-financing from COREBE, COBINABE and OTNPB is part of the in kind governments contributions.

2) Done

3) The bulk of the private sector in the basin is made of small holder farmers, with a few larger agricultural enterprises. During PPG work, efforts will be made to engage them in project execution (TDA-SAP) including through provision of co-financing.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response N/A

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

The LDCs under the principle of equitable access?

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

Agency Response N/A

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) Please remove Yellow Sea LME from Indicator 7 Number of shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management.

(2) Please detail in the explanation field how Core Indicator 11 was reached, including the sex disaggregation calculation. Is the entire basin population a realistic target? Would it be more appropriate to include the calculation of the number of direct beneficiaries from the requested demonstration activities (see Table B comment above)?

(3) Please explain why Core Indicator 7.3 is rated "3" and not "4".

(4) Since the expected impact, according to the theory of change, is a program of reforms and investments for the reversal of water and soil degradation trends in the basin, please consider whether the project should target Core Indicator 4. If yes, please include targets accordingly and explain the calculation in the explanation field. If not, please explain why.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Partly addressed. Please detail in the explanation field how Core Indicator 11 was reached. Please include and expand on the response in the review sheet.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done

2) Pilot demonstrations are not part of the project, for reasons previously explained. In the long-term, all inhabitants of the basin will benefit from the increased water security and climate change resilience that the project will strive to achieve.

3) Clerical error

4) Core indicator 4.3 could be in principle a target, provided that the project operate in a well-defined, measurable landscape. Since the project addresses the root causes of degradation (insufficient upstream/downstream and transboundary cooperation, etc.) in the entire basin and in a variety of landscapes, this indicator is not considered applicable.

17/05/2022

1) It is included now.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Following revisions, please review the taxonomy worksheet and ensure all keywords are tagged.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response 1) reviewed.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) The problems, including root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are not sufficiently clear. Please expand this section utilizing the following sub-headings: (i) global environmental problems; (ii) root causes; (iii) barriers that need to be addressed. Please take cues from the Pantanal PIF (GEF ID 10554) when reconstructing this section.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

- (1) Please upload to the portal the Terminal Evaluation for the "Bermejo SAP II project".
- (2) It is recognized that COBINABE was not operational from from 2009-2017 and that it has resumed activities since late 2017. Please describe COBINABE activities from 2017 to present. Did implementation of the PROBER begin? How is COBINABE now carrying out its mandate? Please include reasons for the governments' joint decision to revive COBINABE and expand its mandate.
- (3) Please describe relevant baseline activities of COREBE and OTNPB.
- (4) Please add dates to baseline activities under heading "Government funded actions", where possible. Please also be clear on which projects are national and which are binational.
- (5) Please note whether the original SAP was signed, and if so, when and by whom.
- (6) Please describe the higher-level objectives and strategic actions of the original SAP, on which the 34 sub-projects were built.
- (7) Please detail the process to prepare the original TDA and SAP, including key stakeholders involved.
- (8) Please provide a baseline annex listing what the 34 sub-projects were and detailing the 11 sub-projects executed jointly by both countries.
- (9) Please describe any relevant baseline projects for La Plata Basin, as Core Indicator 7 targets La Plata Basin and the global environmental benefits should link to water resources management of the overall La Plata Basin.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

- 1) Done
- 2) Please see the attached explanatory text prepared by the countries, including countries' financial contributions to COBINABE.
- 3) Please see the attached explanatory text prepared by the countries, including countries' financial contributions to COBINABE
- 4) Done
- 5) See Annex "Acta 39 COBINABE".

- 6) A rather detailed description of the SAP process and of the rationale of the pilots selection is provided in the baseline section under “GEF IW involvement in the basin”.
- 7) The Bermejo TDA-SAP process was the first ever developed in an IW project (1996), and followed the guidelines contained in the GEF IW Operational Strategy of 1995, setting standards for future foundational projects.
- 8) The annexed Terminal Evaluation is the best available source of information
- 9) Actually, core indicator 7 targets the transboundary Bermejo Basin, not the La Plata Basin. However the Bermejo Basin was not an option listed in the GEF portal.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

- (1) Please ensure the comments above pertaining to Table B are reflected in this section.
- (2) Please map the barriers that need to be addressed (which need to be added to Part II Section 1 above) to project outcomes and outputs.
- (3) Please take presentation and substance cues from the Alternative Scenario section in the Pantanal project (GEF ID 10554) and recast and sufficiently detail this section accordingly. For each component, present the outcome, which barriers the component will address, and the outputs. Please number and describe each output as it is presented in Table B, so the reader can clearly understand what the project will do. For example, the current explanation of how the project will "foster the reform of COBINABE's mode of operation...consolidate its institutional structure"... etc is unconvincing. Further, what will the three-pronged approach to conjunctive management lead to? Please also quantify outputs at this stage, where possible.
- (4) Please include demonstration/pilot projects (Table B comment above) in the project's theory of change. Funds for the pilot program could seemingly, in part, come from Component 4, as the Component 4 GEF financing allocation seems quite high to deliver the planned outputs.
- (5) Please ensure the SAP output includes SAP signature at the ministerial level by both countries.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

- 1) Done
- 2) Done
- 3) Done
- 4) See response 6 above
- 5) Done

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) The section notes that "project interventions are in line with three strategic actions, namely IW 3-5, IW 3-6 and IW 3-7". However, Table A only includes IW 3-6. Please clarify this discrepancy. Please also describe why the project interventions align with these three IW focal area elements.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

- 1) Clerical error. Corrected

1) Clerical error. Corrected

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please take cues from the Pantanal project (GEF ID 10554) to flesh out this section to the requisite standard.

(2) Please split the incremental cost reasoning and global environmental benefits into separate sections.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done

2) Done

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) Stating "the project will accrue global environmental benefits in terms of increased transboundary cooperation, improved water security of local populations, and protection of soil resources and of ecosystem services" is not a sufficient presentation of the global environmental benefits the project will contribute to. Please take cues from the Pantanal project (GEF ID 10554) to flesh out this section to the requisite

standard. Please also explain how the project's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) is achievable.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) The current submission is unconvincing and skeletal. Please use past project lessons to frame how this new project is different in terms of its innovativeness, sustainability and scalability. Please be more specific in each of the three sub-sections.

(2) Please incorporate the suggested inter-ministerial committees (Table B comment above) to the sustainability sub-section.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) We disagree on this statement. The text is succinct but crystal clear in terms of the substance.

2) Done

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

(1) The uploaded Annex A map is geo-referenced and includes coordinates.

Agency Response N/A

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) Please identify the respective roles and means of engagement for each project stakeholder. This can be presented in table form.

(2) Please detail how the stakeholders will be engaged during project preparation (in PPG).

(3) Please expand on any plans for a stakeholder engagement and communication plan during project implementation.

(4) Please detail the activities under Component 1 ("Stakeholder Engagement and Awareness Raising") in this section

(4) Please detail the activities under Component 4 (Stakeholder Engagement and Awareness Raising) in this section.

(5) Please expand on how stakeholder participation was "built into project formulation". What were the campaigns and training courses? Who carried them out and who did they reach and when? How were they useful to the preparation of the PIF? Which stakeholders were engaged during preparation of this PIF?

(6) "Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities" was selected as a stakeholder participating in consultations during project identification phase. Please note in this section that the project preparation and implementation will adhere to the GEF Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) The PIF identifies over 100 governmental and non-governmental stakeholders. Roles and means of engagement have hence been described according to the stakeholder typology. Done.

2) Done

3) Done

4) Done

5) These questions do not appear to apply to the PIF preparation phase. Stakeholders engaged in the PIF preparation phase are described under the Stakeholders section.

6) Done

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please explain plans to address gender in project design, including that there will be a full gender analysis carried out and a gender equity and mainstreaming plan developed during PPG.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please explain why the private sector can be a driver for change in the basin. Please explain why private sector entities are not listed as keys stakeholders in the Stakeholders section above.

(2) Please map private sector engagement to specific project outputs. Please explain how the private sector will be specifically engaged. Please take guidance from the private sector engagement section in the Pantanal project (GEF ID 10554) PIF.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) Done.

2) Done.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please include a detailed Covid-19 risk and opportunity analysis.

(2) Please include a climate change risk and proposed mitigation measure.

(3) Given COBINABE "suffered an eight year break due to both political and socioeconomic factors", please explain how the "Lack of sustained political support..." risk is only rated "Low". To understand the probability of this risk, it will be important to know what the "initial political determination to resume cooperative efforts for reversing degradation trends in the basin" is. Please detail the minutes of the decision to "revive" COBINABE, if available. Please also note what COBINABE's activities and operating arrangements have been since 2017.

(4) The risk mitigation response to the subsurface data risk notes that "the project will strive to achieve an effective engagement of the private sector that will be crucial for the assessment and diagnostic of the groundwater resources in the basin". This action is not included under the private sector engagement section. Please include it accordingly.

(5) Please note that these risks will be further assessed and proposed measures further developed during PPG.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Partly addressed.

(1) The Covid risk and opportunity analysis is not fully present. Please expand on the risks and also include a write up on what the opportunities are for the project to support a green recovery from the pandemic. What will be done during PPG in terms of Covid analysis?

(2) Please note in the portal submission that climate change is not considered to represent a risk and that a more detailed analysis of

climate change risk will be made during PPG. Please also include a preliminary assessment of the climate change risk in the matrix.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

- 1) The section on Covid-19 in the Risk table, appears to fully respond to this request.
- 2) Climate change was not considered to represent a risk in the project execution context. However a more detailed Climate Change Risk Analysis will be made during the PPG- project document design.
- 3) Countries have decided to revive COBINABE and during PIF preparation have demonstrated their determination to do so. The GEF support is considered critical by the countries for transboundary cooperation to move to a higher level in scope and political commitment. This is the rationale that determined the Low rating. Please see annexes: Acta 39 COBINABE, Acta COBINABE 35, Acta 38 COBINABE (XXXVIII), Joint Declaration of the Presidents of Bolivia & Argentina.
- 4) Done
- 5) Done

17/05/2022

- 1) Done
- 2) Done.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes. But please address the following:

- (1) For clarity, please add OTNPB to the first sentence, "in partnership with COBINABE, COREBE and OTNPB". Please briefly explain the mandates of COREBE and OTNPB in this section.
- (2) Are there any bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area that the project may coordinate with. If so, please detail which ones and how?
- (3) Please describe how the project will coordinate to support La Plata SAP implementation.
- (4) Please explain how the project may coordinate with the Chaco project.
- (5) Please explain how the project may coordinate with the Pantanal project (GEF ID 10554), which is currently in the PPG phase.
- (6) Given the project's focus on groundwater, please explain how the project may coordinate with the Guarani Aquifer project (GEF ID 10139).

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Partly addressed.

- (1) Not addressed.
- (2) Addressed.
- (3) Addressed
- (4) Not addressed. Please explain how the project may coordinate with the Chaco project.
- (5) Not addressed. Please explain how the project may coordinate with the Pantanal project (GEF ID 10554), which is currently in the PPG phase.
- (6) Not addressed. Given the project's focus on groundwater, please explain how the project may coordinate with the Guarani Aquifer project (GEF ID 10139)

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

- 1) Done
- 2) done

3) Done

4) Done

5) Done

6) Done

For more details see the information in annexes: Acta 39 COBINABE, Acta COBINABE 35, Acta 38 COBINABE (XXXVIII), Joint Declaration of the Presidents of Bolivia & Argentina.

17/05/2022

1) Done

4) Done

5) Done

6) Done.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please explain how the project fosters compliance with the UN Convention and achievement of certain SDGs. How is the project aligned with the listed Argentina Water Plan and Bolivia's Multi-year program? The section notes that "the proposed project is aligned with, and supports the relevant legislation and strategic documents of the Bermejo riparian countries and responds to the priorities indicated therein". Please describe which ones and how.

(2) Please provide how the project is aligned with the La Plata Basin SAP and associated country NAPs.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

- 1) The PIF text, although deliberately succinct, provides all the elements to answer these questions, in terms achievement of the SDGs *relevant* to the project, consistency with the UN Water Convention, adherence with national priorities, alignment with the La Plata basin SAP.
- 2) Done.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please provide information about (i) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan; (ii) plans to learn from ongoing relevant projects and initiatives; (iii) proposed knowledge outputs beyond the Information Management System to be produced and shared with stakeholders, including experience notes, result stories, multimedia and outreach materials; (iv) how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability; and (v) plans for strategic communications outside the Information Management System, including use of [IW:LEARN](#) services, stakeholder outreach, and participation in the GEF International Waters Conferences.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Not addressed. Please consolidate the knowledge management approach in this section, including responses to the above request.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

11/05/2022

1) As described in much detail, the project concept draws from lessons learned during the previous Bermejo IW project, and specific references are made throughout the text to the importance of knowledge and to the strategic communication mechanisms that the project will adopt (Component 4).

17/05/2022

1) Done.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response N/A

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

24th of April 2022 (thenshaw): No.

(1) The Bolivia LOE is dated September 16, 2020 and does not include the signature of the current OFP. Please secure an up-to-date LOE for Bolivia signed by the current OFP Mr. Carlos David Guachalla Terrazas (OFP since July 2021).

(2) The uploaded Bolivia LOE is in Spanish. Please include an English version or English translation of the new LOE in the portal. The letter also lacks some mandatory information (i.e. the table of distribution of GEF resources). Please use the LOE template provided on the GEF website and provide the letter in English.

(3) Regarding the LOE from Argentina. The title of the letter makes reference to co-financing and there is a line at the end of the letter that also stipulates in-kind and investment mobilized co-financing. Please use the LOE template provided on the GEF website. The LOE should also include a line informing on the executing agency. This is missing from the letter provided. The PPG amount in the table in the letter includes a PPG Agency Fee when the PPG Agency fee should be included in the column "Fee" in the letter.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Partly addressed.

(1) Addressed.

(2) Partly addressed. The LOE does not include a line informing on the executing agency as OAS. Please secure a new OFP letter or label the Other Executing Partner field in the Project Information section as "To Be Determined", which can then be adjusted to OAS during PPG. Please leave empty the field "Executing Partner Type".

(3) Partly Addressed. The PPG amount in the table in the letter includes a PPG Agency Fee when the PPG Agency fee should be included in the column "Fee" in the letter. Please see if a new letter can be secured in the short timeframe.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. Please upload reformatted letters once received.

Agency Response

1) Done.

2) The new LOE is in English

3) Done

17/05/2022

2) Done.

3) We asked the countries for updated LOEs, but it will take several days to have them ready. At this time, the current letters express the countries commitment with the project.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

N/A

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

26th of April 2022 (thenshaw). No. Please address above comments and resubmit.

16th of May 2022 (thenshaw): No. Please address above comments and resubmit.

18th of May 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/24/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

