



Integrated Management for Sustainable Reduction (IMSRed) of POPs, Highly Hazardous Pesticides, and industrial chemicals in Argentina

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11451

Countries

Argentina

Project Name

Integrated Management for Sustainable Reduction (IMSRed) of POPs, Highly Hazardous Pesticides, and industrial chemicals in Argentina

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

10/31/2023

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

FSP

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

This project is eligible under the Chemicals and Waste strategy.

In the project information table the type of executing agency is missing.

ES, 11/9/23: Adjected. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: adjusted.

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 The project is well developed and includes a component on policy coherence.

Agency's Comments

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

The project objective is clear, but the project is missing a theory of change. Please add the Theory of Change.

11/9/23: Theory of change included. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: Theory of Change is included in the Documents section as a separate document. It has now been included in the Project Description text box.

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

Secretariat's Comments

PPO: Gender: During PPG, it is expected that a more thorough gender analysis will have been conducted and that gender dimensions are elaborated in the project description and substantively integrated in the project components, in particular, Component 2 and in M&E.

ES, 11/9/23: Please reply in the comments on how PPO's comment on gender was addressed.

ES, 11/14/23: Gender comments were addressed. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/9/23: Argentina is a pioneer in the development of legislative instruments that advocate for the rights of women and people of the LGBTTTNBIQ+ community, among which are the following:

- ? National Integrated Pension System Law No. 24.476.
- ? Law of Integral Protection to Prevent, Punish and Eradicate Violence against Women N? 26.485.
- ? Equal Marriage Law N? 26.618.
- ? Gender Identity Law N? 26.743.

? ?Micaela? Law: Mandatory training on gender issues and violence against women N? 27.499.

? Law for the Promotion of Access to Formal Employment for Transvestites, Transsexual and Transgender Persons N? 27.636.

? Law No. 26.610 on Access to Voluntary Interruption of Pregnancy (IVE).

? Law N? 27.611 on Integral Health Care and Attention during Pregnancy and Early Childhood.

These achievements were gained thanks to the joint work of various actors, from state institutions to NGOs and civil society. However, there is still a long way to go if we consider the intersection between environment and gender. In this sense, although there are precedents on public policies that focus on these issues, it is vitally important to continue with this work.

The MAyDS has carried out various activities that provide a clearer picture of how to develop policies on chemicals management that incorporate the gender and diversity perspective. Among these actions, the survey of data with an intersectional perspective and the use of these inputs to develop actions specifically designed for women, lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transvestites, trans, non-binary and other identities stand out. As a result, the gender and diversity perspective are present both in the layout and in the implementation of activities as set forth on the proposal, whether for institutional communication, convening and content creation.

Through different efforts, the MAyDS has previously carried out activities aimed at reducing the gender gap in terms of time and care, health, income, and work. Through the implementation of the Pilot Test of the National Survey on Chemical Substances and Gender, it was observed that the feminization of care tasks, which fall mostly on women and identities of the LGBTTTNBIQ+ community, has a negative impact on exposure to chemical substances and products.

An literature review of publications revealed the existence of a low number of academic works that analyze substances and chemical products and toxic wastes from a broad gender perspective. In the search of academic repositories, only 10 texts by researchers in Argentina and 3 in the region were found. Thus, it was found that there are still challenges in relation to the generation, availability, statistics, and gender indicators. In this context, the current proposal presents an opportunity to transform gender equality and human rights into action. Gender analysis will be included to define the specific dynamics of the context linked to the sectors and will include provisions to apply the appropriate approach.

Given that in Argentina the management of knowledge, training and teaching of the next generations is also a feminized task, the MAyDS carried out actions to ensure that women and the LGBTIQ+ community have access to updated knowledge and training products,

promoting gender parity in the participation of the different specific technical training activities and avoiding the reproduction of stereotypes related to risky tasks.

There is evidence that professional training in the academic field with a gender perspective reduces the labor and income gap, so that, in the call for training sessions carried out by GEF 8, priority will be given to the attendance of women and people from the LGBTTTNBIQ+ community. This is in response to the fact that this population is underrepresented in the exact sciences, while concentrated only in the initial levels of scientific careers, and faces greater difficulties than men in training, accessing funding and publishing in prestigious journals.

On the other hand, it is considered that there is a difference in terms of health and labor, with regards to the appropriate safety measures, the actions to develop and the risk associated with the handling of contaminated equipment. Therefore, measures will be taken to introduce these considerations when operating / discarding contaminated equipment.

It is also true that gender considerations are not just a women's issue, but that this approach brings advantages to entire communities and benefits minorities and general population. For the design of the current proposal, it is important to take the lessons learned for the elaboration of a Gender Action Plan. To this end, women and youth will be placed special throughout the project, for example, by supporting and strengthening territorial management systems and natural resources; traditional food and agricultural practices; environment-related livelihoods and how those resources are distributed. When this population is empowered, entire families benefit, and these benefits have an impact on future generations.

Gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources have been shown to be exacerbated by the effects of climate change, which disproportionately affect the poor and most vulnerable, especially women. Recognizing gender-specific differences in access to chemicals' resources, services, information and employment opportunities is key to generating positive outcomes. To achieve this, inclusive consultations will be held with stakeholders, seeking to empower women and queer people in the implementation of solutions based on environmentally sound management and the promotion of sustainable income-generating opportunities.

Finally, the current proposal aims to improve the conditions of women and their dependents through security and access to resources, services and employment opportunities, and strategic interventions to encourage their participation and thus enhance their representation in decision-making bodies at all levels. This approach recognizes the important role they play as agents of change and is therefore considered when working with existing human capital at local, national and regional levels. It is also imperative that they are adequately represented in the formulation and implementation of legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks. This necessarily implies promoting good practices to facilitate access to funding for grassroots organizations of women and dissidents working on issues related to

the environment, agriculture and the environmentally sound management of substances and chemicals.

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

co-financing is low and co-financing details are missing.

PMC and PMC ratio is ok.

ES, 11/9/23: co-financing has been adjusted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: adjusted

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 Yes.

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 Yes, there is strong justification for the project and it includes relevant stakeholders.

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

Theory of change is missing. Please include a theory of change.

ES, 11/9/23: Updated. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: included in the Project Description text box.

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 Yes.

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

The institutional arrangements are missing please clarify this is the portal document.

Coordination with ongoing projects is missing.

ES, 11/9/23: The sections have been updated. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: included

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

Please include the tons of e-waste in indicator 9.6.

ES 11/9/23: 9.6 has been updated. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: included

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

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 Yes, the risks are identified.

Agency's Comments

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 Yes, this project is innovative and addresses policy coherence.

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 Yes.

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 Yes.

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 Comments NA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Please include a stakeholder list.

PPO: Stakeholder engagement: Agree with PM that agency must include stakeholder list. In addition, Agency should provide more detailed information on the different relevant stakeholder groups consulted and detailed on their relevant roles to project outcomes and project components.

ES, 11/9/23: Stakeholder list has been added. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: included

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 NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

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 Yes

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
co-financing is low and co-financing details are missing from the co-financing table.
Please provide indicative sources of co-financing.

ES, 11/9/23: Adjusted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response 11/8/23: adjusted

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (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 Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments 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 Yes

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 Comments NA

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 Yes

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 Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

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 Comments NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 11/9/23: One question on gender remains.

ES, 11/14/23: PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

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	10/31/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/14/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

