



# Comprehensive land management in forestry and agri-food systems of three water basins in Argentina to contribute to Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and to mitigation and adaptation to climate change

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10866

**Countries**

Argentina

**Project Name**

Comprehensive land management in forestry and agri-food systems of three water basins in Argentina to contribute to Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and to mitigation and adaptation to climate change

**Agencies**

CAF

**Date received by PM**

9/23/2023

**Review completed by PM**

1/31/2024

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

FSP

**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  
**October 10, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**March 05, 2024 (Answer to the recommendation)**

4. Done, please see Table A.

**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

**October 10, 2023:**

1. In Table B, the description of the targets 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 is too long. Please summarize them in few words in table B and provide the details in the alternative scenario section.
2. The output "2.1. Increased resilience of LD-affected ecosystems to climate variability and extreme weather events" is the same as the outcome 2.1 and is not consistent with the Project Results Framework and the budget table. Please correct the name of this output.
3. There is no need to include indicators and targets under the outputs 2.1 and 2.2. Please remove them and ensure these indicators and targets are **summarized under the outcomes 2.1 and 2.2.**
4. The output "2.2. Improvement of land productivity and provision of ecosystem services in the intervention basins, contributing to improving the quality of life of the population" is the same as the outcome 2.2 and is not consistent with the Project Results Framework and the budget table. Please correct the name of this output.
5. The output "3.1.1. Resource mobilization strategy designed and implemented" is the same as the outcome 3.1 is not consistent with the Project Results Framework and the budget table. Please correct the name of this output.
6. The output "3.1.2 At least one incentive mechanism developed and available to producers" is actually a target. Please clarify this output and formulate it as an output (not a target).

**December 7, 2023:**

We don't see the changes as compared to the previous version. Please address the comments and highlight in yellow the changes in the Portal entry.

**December 15, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments. In the Agency reponse box below, please respond to each comment individually keeping the numbering of each comment. Please also add a date of the Agency response.

**January 16, 2024:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

## Agency Response

1. Done, detailed activities and products have been moved to the alternative scenario section
  2. Done, the output has been corrected [PORTAL]
  3. Done [PORTAL]
  4. Done, the output has been corrected [PORTAL]
  5. Done, the output has been corrected [PORTAL]
  6. Done, Output 3.1.2 has been correctly written, and the target moved to its correct position.
- Thank you

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue character and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in page 1, 2 and 5.

The following text has been added: "Indicator 1.1.1.a Number of regulatory proposals ready to be sent to legislative bodies for approval and/or update

Target: Regulatory proposals prepared (Tucuman and Entre R?os)"

Indicator 1.1.2.a. Actions and contributions agreed upon in six identified multi-stakeholder spaces (CAN, ONDTyD, Sal?-Dulce River Basin Committee, Pasaje-Juramento-Salado River Basin Committee, PIECAS-DP)

Target: Entre R?os - Agreed-upon knowledge management and demonstrative actions

The following text has been reviewed: "Indicator 2.2.1 Area of productive systems under sustainable land management (hectares).

Target Core Indicator 4.3. 39,000 ha

Target: Tucuman

Sustainable Land Management with small and medium local producers (Cuenca Marapa, 4000 ha, 200 beneficiaries)

Entre R?os

- Terraced reservoirs. Avoid water degradation by improving the quantity and quality of productive soils (5000 hectares)

- Sustainable Land Management (30,000 ha)

Indicator 2.2.1 Area of restored degraded agricultural land (hectares). Forest surfaces restored by climatic events (floods, droughts) and anthropic actions (fire)

Target Core Indicator 4.3: 21,000 ha

Target: Tucuman

Investment Plans (Marapa San Ignacio Sub Basin, 4000 ha) Sustainable Land Management with small and medium local producers (Cuenca Marapa, 2000 ha)

Entre R?os"

The following text has been reviewed: "Target Core Indicator 6.1: 5,231,544 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (direct) sequestration and/or avoided emissions"

The following text has been added: "Indicator 3.1.1 New public and private participants brought to the working group, with specific commitments within the Resource Mobilization Strategy, classified by jurisdiction (national/subnational)

Target: New participants and proposals in Tucuman, Entre R<sup>os</sup> and Santiago del Estero"

"Indicator 3.1.2 Number of economic instruments for the promotion of productive activities aligned with the LDN guidelines and resilience to climate change

Target: At least one incentive mechanism developed and available to producers"

"Indicator 3.1.3 Number, gender and type of beneficiaries who go to the market within sustainable production models

Target: at least 3250 beneficiary producers in Tucum<sup>n</sup>, Entre R<sup>os</sup> and Santiago del Estero"

## December 19, 2023

1. Detailed activities and products have been moved to the alternative scenario section. Please see Table B now only includes outcomes (with indicators and targets) and outputs for each component.

Target 1.1.1 a. Target: Regulatory proposals prepared (Tucuman and Entre R<sup>os</sup>)"

Target 1.1.2 a. Target: Entre R<sup>os</sup> - Agreed-upon knowledge management and demonstrative actions.

2. The 2.2.1 output name has been corrected. The following text was added: 2.1.1. Integration of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) measures into land use planning systems to avoid, reduce and reverse LD.

3. 3, 4 and 5. All outcomes (numbered x.y) and outputs (numbered x.y.z) have been reviewed and corrected where necessary. Please see Table B, component 2 and 3.

4. Outcome 2.2. ?Improvement of land productivity and provision of ecosystem services in the intervention basins, contributing to improving the quality of life of the population? and output 2.2.1. ?Implementation of SLM in agri-food systems, integrated into territorial planning systems?, were adjusted in the table B, Annex A, budget and alternative scenario.

5. Outcome 3.1. ?Innovative financial mechanisms designed and implemented? and output 3.1.1. ?Resource mobilization strategy designed and implemented?, was reviewed in Table B and Annex A.

6. Done, Output 3.1.2 ?Incentive mechanisms co-developed, shared, and promoted?, has been correctly written, and the target moved to its correct position. Thank you.

All components, outcomes and outputs were reviewed throughout the CEO Endorsement and in all accompanying documents.

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/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

**October 10, 2023:**

1. The co-financing letter from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS) indicates a total of \$ 10,489,963 which includes different kind of co-financing (Public Investment and in-kind). Please provide a letter specifying the amount of the each kind of co-financing.
2. The co-financing letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAGyP) indicates a total of \$ 3,531,907 which includes different kind of co-financing (Public Investment and in-kind). Please provide a letter specifying the amount of the each kind of co-financing.
3. The co-financing letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAGyP) is a word document not signed nor dated. Please provide a signed and dated co-financing letter.
4. The co-financing letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAGyP) is said to be from the "Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAGyP by its Spanish acronyms)". Is it a Secretary of a Ministry? Please clarify and ensure the information provided is consistent.
5. The co-financing letter from MAGyP-National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA by its Spanish Acronyms) indicates a total of \$6,348,323 which includes different kind of co-financing (Public Investment and in-kind). Please provide a letter specifying the amount of the each kind of co-financing.
6. The co-financing letter from MAGyP-National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA by its Spanish Acronyms) is a word document not signed nor dated. Please provide a signed and dated co-financing letter.
7. The co-financing letter from Ministry of Works - National Water Institute (INA by its Spanish acronyms) indicates a total of \$137,646 which includes different kind of co-financing

(Public Investment and in-kind). Please provide a letter specifying the amount of the each kind of co-financing.

**December 7, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**January 16, 2024:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. In the co-financing table, the links for the MAGyP and INTA lead to word format and not signed letters, but we note that these letters are loaded in the document tab of the Portal as pdf and signed letters. Please include the right links for the MAGyP and INTA in the co-financing table.

**January 31, 2024:**

Thank you for correcting the links. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done

2. Done

3 & 4. The letter from the current Secretary (formerly Ministry) has been uploaded

5. Done

6. Done

7. Done

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal.

**December 19, 2023**

1-6. There are nine (9) letters of co-financing, which are attached in pdf format and electronically signed through the GDE system. The letters correspond to each line indicated in Table C of the CEO Endorsement and to the total amount indicated. Thank you.

January 24, 2024

Done. Links in the co-financing table have been corrected.

**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  
**October 10, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**October 10, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**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  
**October 10, 2023:**

1. In the core indicator section, there is a mistake: the METT scores are reported under the column "Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)". Please correct.



2. For the indicator 6.1, 2 different EX-ACT tools are uploaded and none of them provide the same result as the one reported in the core indicator section. Please ensure only 1 EX-ACT tool is uploaded and it is relevant to the expected result indicated in all the project description.

**December 7, 2023:**

1 and 2. The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**January 16, 2024:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done, METT scores have been correctly uploaded [PORTAL]

2. Done, the correct EX-ACT tool has been correctly uploaded [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in page 6, 28 and 57.

The following text has been reviewed: "Indicator 2.2.2 Number of EbA measures identified, prioritized, implemented and coordinated with planning policies

Target Core Indicator 4.4: 14,300 ha

Target: Tucuman Santa Ana Provincial Park

- Fire risk analysis (5000 ha)

- Control of Overgrazing and control of exotics (2000 ha)

Entre R?os Pre-Delta National Park

- Control of invasive alien species (300 ha)

Santiago del Estero Copo National Park

- Control of exotic invasive species (4000 ha)

- Fire risk analysis to work in Fire Management (3000 ha)

Target Core Indicator 1.2: 134,727 ha

Target Core Indicator 6.1: 5,231,544 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (direct) sequestration and/or avoided emissions"

**Core indicator 6: Greenhouse gas emission mitigated**

Indicator 6.1: Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector

5,231,544 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent sequestered and/or not emitted.

**GEF Core Indicator 6.1: 5,231,544 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (direct) sequestration and/or avoided emissions Tucuman Santa Ana Provincial Park**

**December 19, 2023**

1. Corrected. The METT scores were adjusted in the annex F ?Core Indicator Worksheet?. In the Endorsement column you will see the values 35, 44 and 34.
2. Corrected. The core indicator 6.1 were updated in the corresponding section of the portal (5,231,544 tCO<sub>2</sub>e). The updated excel tool is attached as attachment 1.

**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  
**October 15, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**October 15, 2023:**

Yes, with extensive relevant description at regional levels. Cleared.

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  
**October 19, 2023:**

1. The names of the component 1, component 3 and the outcome 2.1 are different from table B. Please correct the names and ensure all the names of the components, outcomes and outputs are the same throughout all the project description.

2. The alternative scenario section is not expected to be a simple copy-paste of the of the outcomes and outputs names as they appear in table. In this section and under each output, please present the concrete activities that will be carried out to achieve the expected outcomes (1 paragraph per output can be enough as long as the concrete activities are clearly presented).

3. The TOC digram is not readable. Please provide a readable TOC either in the Portal entry (as it is now) or as a separate uploaded document in the Document tab of the Portal (if it is easier due to the size of the diagram).

**December 7, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

1 and 3. The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

2. The clarification provided is vague and/or very succinct for the component 2 and 3, and it is only visible in the review sheet. Please elaborate further on the activities and ensure the additional text is provided in the Portal entry (and not only in the review sheet).

**January 16, 2024:**

1 and 2. Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

3. The Theory of Change is still not readable. As requested in the previous review, please provide a readable TOC either in the Portal entry (as it is now) or as a separate uploaded document in the Document tab of the Portal (if it is easier due to the size of the diagram).

**January 31, 2024:**

Thank you for uploading the TOC. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done

2. A description of activities within each output has been included in the section

3. A file named ToC.pdf has been uploaded [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in page 18, 19, 20 and 21.

The following text has been added: "**Component 1. Comprehensive governance of land management within a LDN framework**"

Expected Outcome 1.1. Consolidation of institutional political structure in charge of territorial planning at national and subnational level, within LDN framework and in synergy with adaptation and mitigation of climate change

To obtain this result, outputs and targets are envisaged as follows:

? 1.1.1. Provincial and local regulatory framework linked to land use planning and management developed and/or updated with LDN and climate change concepts

o The project provides support to national, provincial and local public entities for the development of proposals, revision and updating of regulations related to NDT considering climate change.

o Meetings between provincial ministries, municipalities, producer associations, NGOs, business organizations, MAYDS, universities and research and extension institutions. Technical training. Presentations to the corresponding organisms (Ministries, Legislature)

o Targets

? Tucuman

- Propose modification of decree 2025 09/2021 in the following points:

Support the creation of an executing agency for Integrated Land Management, soil degradation and climate change projects

Propose the adaptation of the Revolving Fund mechanism for desertification

- Support the incorporation of considerations on adaptation and mitigation to climate change in the regulations of Law 9374 on Soil Conservation

- Support the incorporation of the PAP in the Provincial Climate Change Response Plan

- Contribute to the harmonization of the law updating the OTBN (in preparation) with Law 9374, reinforcing the function of the native forest in the prevention of land degradation and the obligation of restoration by the owners on the properties that suffered processes of soil losses due to unauthorized clearings

? Entre R?os

- Support the updating and implementation of the Soil Conservation Law

- Propose a draft Territorial Planning Law

- Support the regulation of Basin Committees

? 1.1.2. Strengthened participation mechanisms for co-production and consultancy for comprehensive land management in multi-stakeholder spaces (national, inter-jurisdictional,

and provincial inter-institutional), within the LDN framework and in synergy with climate change adaptation and mitigation

- o The project convenes, supports and boosts these participation mechanisms throughout its duration

- o Institutional participation in these spaces implies a commitment to the development of management tools and agreed actions focused on NDT and Climate Change, according to each multi-stakeholder space.

- o The invitations take into account the gender and territorial balance

- o Target

? Entre R?os

- Development of a sustainable management plans Manual that considers relevant issues such as:

  - Control of exotic species focused on Extraction

  - Management of terraces

- Dissemination and training mechanisms for the application of regulations related to land use planning and soil conservation

- Strengthening of Local Governments

- Work with island farmers

- Coordination between institutional areas

- Training workshops

- Dissemination information (actions in progress)

- Investigation

- Knowledge transfer (agrotechnical schools, cooperatives, National Parks Administration, Universities)

- Tree Nursery

- Island community with local production

? 1.1.3. The Provincial Action Plans to Combat Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought Mitigation (PAP) for the provinces of Entre R?os and Santiago del Estero are prepared as instruments for the environmental management of the territory with LDN approach and adaptation and mitigation of climate change, and the implementation of the Tucum?n PAP is supported

- o The project convenes, supports and boosts meetings of working groups throughout its duration

- o Institutional participation in these working groups implies a commitment to the development of PAPs focused on NDT and Climate Change (Entre R?os, Santiago del Estero) and the implementation of Tucum?n PAP

- o The invitations take into account the gender and territorial balance

- o Targets

- ? Entre R?os

- Coordination working groups between the provincial government and local governments (Inclusion of at least 10 local actors).

- ? Tucum?n

- Inter-institutional coordination for PAP application

- Operation of the Sali Basin Committee and Marapa and Balderrama sub-basins

- ? Santiago del Estero

- Working groups residents application authority management areas in order to agree on protocols and regulations

- Local working groups meetings with provincial authorities

GEF support for this component, under Objective 2 of the LD Focal Area Strategy, aims to strengthen institutional capacity for good governance of territory management through strengthening participation mechanisms for co-production and advice for comprehensive management of the territory in spaces of multiple actors at the national and interjurisdictional level: CAN, ONDTyD, Sal?-Dulce River Basin Committees, Pasaje-Juramento-Salado River Basin Committee, PIECAS-DP, through strengthening liaison and coordination between these levels and the provincial and local governments, for an effective coordination of policies and a sustained liaison that promotes synergies and consolidates long-term strategies for their implementation in situ.

## **Component 2. Sustainable management in forests and agri-food systems that contribute to LDN**

Expected Outcome 2.1. Increased resilience of LD-affected ecosystems to climate variability and extreme weather events

To obtain this result, outputs are envisaged as follows:

- ? 2.1.1. Integration of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) measures into land use planning systems to avoid, reduce and reverse LD

The project provides incremental support to sustainable forest management, forest protection and forest restoration actions

? 2.1.2. Design and execution of investment plans (for example, green infrastructure, sustainable mechanization)

The project convenes, supports and boosts meetings for design and implementation of investment plans in green infrastructure and sustainable mechanization.

The invitations take into account the gender and territorial balance

? 2.1.3. Execution of Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) actions in native forests, wetlands and natural grasslands with significant carbon content, guaranteeing attention to the vulnerable people

Community-Based Adaptation actions are provided incremental support in the identified basins and sub-basins

Expected Outcome 2.2 Improvement of land productivity and ecosystem service provision in the intervention basins, contributing to the improvement of people's quality of life

To obtain this result, output is envisaged as follows:

? 2.2.1. Implementation of SLM in agri-food systems, integrated into territorial planning systems

Training is carried out, and small and medium producers are provided incremental support in the transition to practices of Sustainable Land Management, erosion and water degradation control.

Activities for the restoration of agricultural lands are provided incremental support.

? 2.2.2. Execution of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) actions in protected natural areas

Fire risk analysis is developed

Ecosystem-based Adaptation measures are provided incremental support in the identified Conservation Units

This component aims to overcome barriers 2 and 3 and it is closely related to Component 1 outcomes since a consolidated institutional political structure at national and subnational level in charge of planning and management of DLDD local capacities development, promoting appropriation by the community of the concepts of LDN and adaptation and mitigation of climate change; technical assistance; intersectoral coordination and dialogue of knowledge; the strengthening of active policies in science, technology and innovation and knowledge

management regarding DLDD, LDN and adaptation and mitigation of climate change; are key outcomes for overcome people's inertia to continue replicating unsustainable production, consumption and marketing practices (Barrier 2) and to strengthen the territorial implementation of sustainable management actions in forest and agri-food systems that contribute to LDN and to increase the resilience to impacts of climate change (Component 2). GEF funds will be used for the implementation of SLM and SFM in forestry and agri-food systems; for the design of investment plans; to foster innovation in market institutions and production chains; for the execution of Ecosystem based Adaptation and Community based Adaptation actions; and for the strengthening of actions aimed at preventing or mitigating forest fires.

Carrying out these actions in the territory will result in the reduction of the vulnerability of the ecosystems affected by DLDD in the face of climatic variability and extreme climatic events (LD-1-4 and LD-1-2); and in improving land productivity and other ecosystem services in the intervention basins, which contributes to the improvement of people's quality of life (LD-1-1).

### **Component 3. Innovative financing and resource mobilization**

Expected Outcome 3.1. Innovative financial mechanisms designed and implemented

To obtain this result, output is envisaged as follows:

? 3.1.1. Resource mobilization strategy designed and implemented

o The project convenes, supports and boosts meetings of the working group to develop and implement the Resource Mobilization Strategy throughout its duration.

o Institutional participation in these working groups implies a commitment to the Resource Mobilization Strategy

o The invitations take into account the gender and territorial balance

o Targets

? Tucuman

Financing Search

- Green bonds

- PIC

? Entre R?os

- Promote the PASE Producers program

? Santiago del Estero

- Financing Green Bonds Sustainable Forestry



- Financing producers MBGI Sustainable Landscapes Project World Bank National Parks (Semi-arid Chaco Landscape)

? 3.1.2. Incentive mechanisms co-developed, shared, and promoted

o Participatory development of economic instruments that promote and strengthen productive activities that implement LDN guidelines and resilience to climate change is encouraged

o Targets

? Entre Rios

- PASE Producer Seal (Sustainable Environmental Producer of Entre Rios)

- Sustainable Soy Seal

- Grassland Meat Seal

Calculation of environmental economic benefits and proposal of compensatory mechanisms (provincial and municipal interference)

? Santiago del Estero

- Sustainable Forest Product Seal

- Grassland Meat Seal

? 3.1.3. Promotion of markets that integrate the entire value chain of sustainable local production models

o Actions of development and promotion will be realised within sustainable production models that also promote gender-balanced participation.

o Targets

? Entre Rios

Sustainable seals (1000 beneficiaries)

? Tucuman

Commercialization of livestock and agricultural products with sustainable management (750 beneficiaries)

Santiago del Estero

Forest products (500 beneficiaries)

Grassland meats (750 beneficiaries)

Sustainable Landscapes Projects (250 beneficiaries)"

**December 19, 2023**

1. The name of components, outcomes and outputs was adjusted throughout the document.

2. The alternative scenario item was supplemented as indicated. Please see new text in each output.

3. The Theory of Change was adjusted according to the changes made. The format is adjusted for correct readability.

**January 24, 2024**

Done. A ToC.pdf file has been uploaded, and the unreadable version deleted from the entry.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 19, 2023:**

1. The "output 2.2" is actually an outcome. Please correct.

2. The presentation of how the project is aligned with LD-1.2 and with LD 1.4 is exactly the same. Please provide a specific text corresponding to the 2 different LD FA objectives.

**December 7, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed in the Portal. Please address the comments.

**January 16, 2024:**

1 and 2. Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]

2. Done [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in page 20.

The following text has been reviewed: "Expected Outcome 2.2 Improvement of land productivity and ecosystem service provision in the intervention basins, contributing to the improvement of people's quality of life

To obtain this result, output is envisaged as follows:

? 2.2.1. Implementation of SLM in agri-food systems, integrated into territorial planning systems

Training is carried out, and small and medium producers are provided incremental support in the transition to practices of Sustainable Land Management, erosion and water degradation control.

Activities for the restoration of agricultural lands are provided incremental support.

? 2.2.2. Execution of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) actions in protected natural areas

Fire risk analysis is developed

Ecosystem-based Adaptation measures are provided incremental support in the identified Conservation Units"

### **December 19, 2023**

1. It was adjusted. Outcome 2.2. ?Improvement of land productivity and provision of ecosystem services in the intervention basins, contributing to improving the quality of life of the population? and output 2.2.1. ?Implementation of SLM in agri-food systems, integrated into territorial planning systems?.

2. It was corrected. Please see ?tem II.4) alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies del CEO ER.

LD-1-1 Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through sustainable land management (SLM): The proposed project specific change lever to accomplish the contribution to LD-1-1 is output 2.2. Improvement of land productivity and ecosystem service provision in the intervention basins, contributing to the improvement of the people's quality of life. This outcome will be achieved by the follow outputs: 2.2.1. Implementation of SLM practices in agri-food systems integrated into land use planning systems, and 2.2.2. Execution of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) actions in protected natural area.

LD-1-4 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape. The project's proposed specific change levers to accomplish the contribution to LD-1-4 are 2.1. Increased resilience of ecosystems affected by LD to climate variability and extreme weather events. This outcome will be achieved by the following outputs: 2.1.1. Integration of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) measures into land use planning systems to avoid, reduce and reverse LD, 2.1.2. Design and execution of investment plans (e.g., green infrastructure, sustainable mechanization) and 2.1.3. Execution of Community-based Adaptation (CbA) actions in native forests, wetlands and natural grasslands with significant carbon contents, guaranteeing care for vulnerable population.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 19, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**October 19, 2023:**

No, surprisingly there is less information provided than at PIF stage. The text is mainly a simple copy-paste of the name of GEF core indicators. Please elaborate on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits.

**December 7, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**January 16, 2024:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Done [PORTAL]

**December 19, 2023:**

1. It was corrected. Please see point II.6) global environmental benefits. The following text was added: "GEBs will be provided in the territorial implementation of actions that will simultaneously impact on increasing climate resilience and improving land productivity, guaranteeing social equity and environmental quality in forestry and agri-food systems of three water basins of the Argentine Republic. This will be achieved by strengthening governance in land management (Component 1); through the implementation of sustainable management actions that will contribute to the achievement of food security in the face of LD processes and the impacts of climate change in the post-pandemic (Component 2); and through the development and implementation of innovative nance and mobilization of resources to provide sustainability to future actions in the territory (Component 3)?".

**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

**October 19, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**October 19, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

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

N/A

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  
**October 19, 2023:**

There is no information on "how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement". Please provide a summary on these aspects.

**December 7, 2023:**

Thank you for the consideration. The table including the "Role in the project" (which has no title) goes beyond the limit of the Portal page (on the right). Please adjust the table so that it fits entirely within the limits of the Portal page.

**December 15, 2023:**

Thank you for adjusting the table. Cleared.

Agency Response

The section now specifies the required aspects

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue letters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in page 35 and 36.

The following text has been added: "A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established, made up from the MAyDS; the representatives of the provincial governments; representatives of the partners or other parties responsible for the project and CAF. The PSC will provide general guidance to the Project Coordinator and Director; evaluate project risks and progress, and provide recommendations to achieve the expected results. Of the people conforming the PSC, at least 50% must be of indigenous origin and/or women.

The provinces will each designate a focal point who will be a counterpart in the project. The DNPpyOAT of the MAyDS will carry out the responsibility of coordinating the Project together

with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA in its Spanish acronym; ME-2021-82501985-APN-DNCI#MAD). More details about the specific tasks and composition of the collegiate bodies and PMU are available in **Annexes 5, 6, 7 & 8**, and a full description will be included in the Project's Operational Manual.

These inter-institutional and intersectoral coordination mechanisms will be maintained and strengthened throughout the project cycle and will be further strengthened with project implementation that promotes interaction from the early stages and building associations that generate and promote policies, practices, and communication. In addition, the project as a knowledge management instrument has among its objectives to disseminate relevant information in a timely manner, easily accessible and in a culturally appropriate format. This strategy will consider the contributions of each sector and will promote active and inclusive participation throughout the project.

The participation mechanisms will be adapted to each sector to guarantee a sustained intervention during the execution of the project. These mechanisms will include face-to-face workshops, meetings, field trips and virtual instances. Other participatory instruments such as interviews, surveys, consultations, and focus groups that, together, contribute to eliminating the barriers that harm those who are usually excluded from the participation process, will be used ensuring that their voices are heard in all stages of the process."

#### **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**

**October 19, 2023:**

1. The table under "Components / Expected outcomes / Outputs" goes beyond the limit of the Portal page (on the right). Please adjust the table so that it fits entirely within the limits of the Portal page.
2. The option "Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources" is not tagged with a yes while we understand it should be if we consider the project activities. Please clarify.

**December 7, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

1. Thank you for adjusting the table. Cleared.
2. The option "Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources" is still not tagged with a "yes". Please clarify.

**January 16, 2024:**

2. Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

### Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]
2. The option is now properly tagged [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in the pages 37 and 38.

The following text has been added: "The project has carried out a gender analysis, and includes inputs for its gender mainstreaming plan as ProDoc's Annex 8, which presents a difficult situation as regards gender issues in the territories: these rural spaces already have a heavy gender imbalance, with male proportions of the relevant population around 70-80% due to the harshness of living conditions for women, adding *machismo* to long work hours and no holidays.

All project indicators that involve people are and will continue to be disaggregated by gender. A **mandatory minimum threshold of 36%** of the relevant population/audience (which is to say, a gender bias of around 20% above female proportion of the population) is established for the participation of women, and a **mandatory minimum threshold of 1%** of the relevant population/audience for the participation of indigenous peoples, in project governance structures and project activities involving beneficiaries. These thresholds are to be applied not only for community-oriented activities, but also for working groups, government staff involved in the project and other activity-specific grouping.

In addition to the former, guidelines are to be incorporated by the project for a gender, intercultural, intergenerational and inclusiveness approach, as identified below.

Project Monitoring and Governance



? Monitoring of gender indicators considering roles, needs, opportunities and participation in decision making.

? Systematization of lessons learned with a gender perspective.

#### Component 1

? Participatory construction with gender equality analysis of LDN measures that strengthen the integrated management of the intervention sites, considering the different needs, interests, perceptions and knowledge of women and men, girls, boys, adolescents and older adults.

? Strengthening and recovery of ancestral knowledge and practices safeguarded by women and senior citizens as guardians of traditional knowledge, biodiversity, food security, governance of natural resources.

#### Component 2

? Participation of women in decision-making in governance mechanisms, with multilevel and multi-stakeholder criteria.

? Priority participation of women in demonstrative activities.

? Knowledge management with a gender and equal opportunities approach and in the exchange of local and regional experiences

#### Component 3

? Empowerment and leadership of women in production under sustainable approaches, generating and strengthening women's capacities, particularly those of vulnerable groups, in the productive value chains of the regions of intervention.

The project aims at a **women beneficiary participation of 36%**, which is to say that **5,500 women or more** will benefit from project activity, with a breakdown by audience as detailed below.

Components / Expected outcomes / Outputs

T W M

---

1. Comprehensive governance of land management within a LDN framework

670

335

335

Components / Expected outcomes / Outputs	T	W	M
1.1 Consolidation of institutional political structure in charge of territorial planning at national and subnational level, within LDN framework and in synergy with adaptation and mitigation of climate change			
1.1.1 Provincial and local regulatory framework linked to land use planning and management developed and/or updated with LDN and climate change concepts	50	25	25
1.1.2 Strengthened participation mechanisms for co-production and consultancy for comprehensive land management in multi-stakeholder spaces (national, inter-jurisdictional, and provincial inter-institutional), within the LDN framework and in synergy with climate change adaptation and mitigation	500	250	250
1.1.3. The Provincial Action Plans to Combat Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought Mitigation (PAP) for the provinces of Entre Ríos and Santiago del Estero are prepared as instruments for the environmental management of the territory with LDN approach and adaptation and mitigation of climate change, and the implementation of the Tucumán PAP is supported	120	60	60
2. Sustainable management in forests and agri-food systems that contribute to LDN	10360	3265	7095
2.1 Increased resilience of LD-affected ecosystems to climate variability and extreme weather events			
2.1.1 Integration of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) measures into land use planning systems to avoid, reduce and reverse LD	2000	500	1500
2.1.2 Design and execution of investment plans (for example, green infrastructure, sustainable mechanization)	3000	900	2100
2.1.3 Execution of Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) actions in native forests, wetlands and natural grasslands with significant carbon content, guaranteeing attention to the vulnerable people	1140	500	640
2.2 Improvement of land productivity and provision of ecosystem services in the intervention basins, contributing to improving the quality of life of the population			
2.2.1 Implementation of SLM in agri-food systems, integrated into territorial planning systems	2300	690	1610
	1300	405	895
2.2.2 Execution of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) actions in protected natural areas	620	270	350
3. Innovative financing and resource mobilization	4230	1900	2330

Components / Expected outcomes / Outputs	T	W	M
3.1 Innovative financial mechanisms designed and implemented			
3.1.1 Resource mobilization strategy designed and implemented	80	40	40
3.1.2. Incentive mechanisms co-developed, shared, and promoted	150	60	90
3.1.3 Promotion of markets that integrate the entire value chain of sustainable local production models	4000	1800	2200
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15260</b>	<b>5500</b>	<b>9760</b>

"

**December 19, 2023**

1. N/A

2. It was corrected.

**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  
**October 19, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**October 19, 2023:**

The climate risk is not enough analyzed. In the "Climate Risk Screening" some hazards are identified but the appropriate mitigation measures are not presented. Please briefly complete the description including an outline of the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and the appropriate mitigation measures for each identified hazard.

**December 7, 2023:**

Thank you for clarifying the climate trends. Nevertheless, there is no improvement as regard to the potential hazards and mitigation measures. Please elaborate further on these aspects.

**December 15, 2023:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

### Agency Response

Climate change projections have been included for the three project locations. As per mitigation measures, the project strengthens a sustainable land management (SLM) approach within and indirectly beyond the intervention sites, with the expected impact of increasing resilience to climate variability and climate change in both ecosystems and the population, and against both droughts and floods, which are the main risks identified derived from climate scenarios. Therefore, project interventions will be designed taking into account these characteristics of the future climate, and precisely with the objective of incorporating them into government and private planning.

Under shorter timeframes, the GoA has special assistance programs for agricultural emergencies and disasters that will be enhanced through project activities, thus increasing the resilience of target populations.

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in pages 39 and 40.

The following text has been added: "Observed and future climate trends: temperature and precipitation

Tucuma?

? Observed trends:

o Temperature has increased by 1.2°C since 1961.

o Precipitation has decreased by 10% since 1961.

? Future projections:

o Temperature is projected to increase by 2.5°C to 3.5°C by 2100.

o Precipitation is projected to decrease by 10% to 20% by 2100.

## Entre Ríos

### ? Observed trends:

o Temperature has increased by 1.5°C since 1961.

o Precipitation has decreased by 5% since 1961.

### ? Future projections:

o Temperature is projected to increase by 3°C to 4°C by 2100.

o Precipitation is projected to decrease by 10% to 20% by 2100.

## Santiago del Estero

### ? Observed trends:

o Temperature has increased by 1.8°C since 1961.

o Precipitation has decreased by 15% since 1961.

### ? Future projections:

o Temperature is projected to increase by 3.5°C to 4.5°C by 2100.

o Precipitation is projected to decrease by 20% to 30% by 2100.

The climate in all three provinces is warming and becoming drier. This is likely to have a significant impact on agricultural production in the future. Some of the specific impacts of climate change on agriculture in these provinces include:

- Increased risk of crop failure due to drought and heat stress.
- Increased risk of pests and diseases.
- Changes in the timing of planting and harvest.
- Changes in the availability of water for irrigation.

Producers can adapt to these changes by:

- Selecting crops and varieties that are more resistant to heat, drought, and pests.
- Using more efficient irrigation techniques.
- Applying soil management practices that help conserve moisture.
- Investing in research and development of new agricultural technologies. "

## 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

**October 19, 2023:**

Please clarify explicitly in the text that the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development will be the Executing Agency (it is the case according to the budget table).

**December 7, 2023:**

Thank you for clarifying. Cleared.

Agency ResponseDone.  
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  
**October 19, 2023:**

The description in this section is a copy-paste of the text already presented under "GEF Alternative" (in section "5) incremental/additional cost reasoning". Please remove the non necessary repetition and ensure the text provided is the relevant one expected in each section of the Portal entry.

**December 7, 2023:**

The comment is not addressed. Please address the comment.

**December 15, 2023:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response  
Done [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal replay has been removed.

**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  
**October 19, 2023:**

1. In the sentence "there is a need to ensure that Monitoring, Reporting, Verification and Evaluation (MRV, M&E)". the word "Monitoring" is missing. Please complete.
2. The table is not readable as below. Please adjust the table.

Key Deliverable	Budget					Y1				
	Total	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1
Establishment and strengthening of continuous community-based disaster risk management and national-level intervention area and national-level restoration plans	45800	15700	14366	4926	3938					
Support to best practice identification and incorporation within SLM plans	61250	5833	11667	17500	26250					
Training and dissemination on SLM practices										
Support to best practice identification and incorporation within Ecosystem-Based Adaptation practices										

**December 7, 2023:**

The comment are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

1. Not addressed. Please add "Monitoring and" in the text "Monitoring, Reporting, Verification and **Monitoring and** Evaluation (MRV, M&E)".
2. Not addressed. The table is still not readable. Please adjust the table.

**January 16, 2024:**

1 and 2. Thank you for addressing the comments. Nevertheless, we note that the total amount allocated in the table is not consistent with the project budget in Annex E (under the column "of which, KM"). Please provide consistent numbers in the 2 tables.

**February 23, 2024:**

The total KM budget of \$339,067 is still different from the \$249,067 in the budget table. There are still inconsistencies between the budget provided in Annex E and the GEF project financing numbers in Table B. As an example, the total for component 1 in Table B is \$ 406,377 and in Annex E its \$381,077. The same comment applies to the other the components. Please ensure the numbers are consistent throughout the project description.

**March 6, 2024:**

Thank you for correcting the numbers. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]
2. Done [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in the page 46 and 47.





Support to best practice identification and incorporation within Ecosystem-Based Adaptation practices	16275	4069	4069	4069	4068															
---	-------	------	------	------	------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

"

**December 19, 2023**

1. The word "Monitoring" was included. "Based on past experiences, there is a need to ensure that Monitoring, Reporting, Verification, Monitoring and Evaluation (MRV, M&E) will be carried out in two dimensions?"
2. The table was adjusted.

**January 24, 2024**

Total KM budget is equal in both tables. A total has been added to the KM budget table in the text to show so.

**March 05, 2024**

Thank you for the comment, the KM amount has been adjusted in the CEO Endorsement and in the corresponding annexes and corresponds to 339,067.

The amounts in Table B and the Budget have been adjusted and match in all components.

**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 CEO Endorsement Request**

**October 19, 2023:**

1. The document "Annex E Project Map(s) and Coordinates" is not a document supporting the ESS. Please remove this document in the list of ESS supporting documents.
2. We don't find the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which needs to explain identified environmental and social management risks in detail and risk

management measures including indigenous peoples' engagement in the project with clear action plans, timeline, and budget. Please clarify.

**December 7, 2023:**

1 and 2. The comment are not addressed. Please the comments.

3. In addition, please note that the climate scenarios and the table risk are a repetition of the Risks section and are not relevant under the Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks. Please remove this repetition.

**December 15, 2023:**

1. Not addressed. Please address this comment.

2. Thank you for he additional information. Cleared.

3. Not addressed. Please address this comment.

**January 16, 2024:**

1. Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

3. Not addressed. Please address this comment.

**January 31, 2024:**

3. Partially. The risk table is still there. Please address this comment removing the repetition.

**March 6, 2024:**

3. For some reason this comment is still not addressed. Please address this comment.

**March 8, 2024:**

Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]

2. Done. Information from the PRODOC, in general in 4. Summary of the Ex Ante Evaluation, and in particular in epigraphs 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, and 4.4. Environmental impact, detailing the project's ESIA, ESMF (Annex 10 ESMF&Safeguards.pdf), specific guidance for engagement with indigenous peoples included in Annex 5. Public Consultation Process & Stakeholder Engagement Plan, with Special

Attention to Indigenous Peoples, and Safeguard monitoring, has been included in the Endorsement Request's epigraph 5. Risks

**Annex 10 has been uploaded to the portal's road map.**

**December 19, 2023:**

1. The annex 10 (DEC 19.2023\_LDN AR\_Annex 10\_ESMF\_Safeguards) it was uploaded.
2. N/A
3. Corrected.

January 24, 2024

The text has been removed as indicated.

March, 05 2024

We have cleaned the text that accompanies the risk table

**March 8, 2024**

Thank you for your patience, we have incorporated the ESS table in point 11.

**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

**October 19, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**October 19, 2023:**

The socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project are not really described: under the "concrete socioeconomic benefits" we learn about environmental governance improved by strengthening the capacities, number of beneficiaries, reduction of conflict and increased ownership... These are not clear socioeconomic benefits. Please elaborate further on clear and concrete socioeconomic benefits.

**December 7, 2023:**

We don't see the changes as compared to the previous version. Please address this comment.

**December 15, 2023:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

### Agency Response

The section has been expanded to better reflect concrete socioeconomic benefits of the project.

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue letters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in the page 45.

The following text has been reviewed: "The project will contribute to the restoration of a significant area of forest and degraded agricultural land, and increase the forest area under sustainable management as well as the area of agricultural land under sustainable management practices. A dual emphasis approach to strengthen the management of protected areas is to be applied, consistent with prioritizing policy frameworks on protected areas as an engine for sustainable development, together with the sustainable use and management of natural resources both within and outside of protected areas. Environmental governance will be improved by strengthening the capacities of a wide range of stakeholders, both men and women, to achieve sustainable management and conservation benefits that will go beyond the project's lifespan. Concrete socioeconomic benefits of the project are designed to be:

? Enhanced Capacities: 5500 or more women will be beneficiaries of the project within its 15000 or more beneficiaries. A minority of beneficiaries, in line with their participation in overall population, will belong to indigenous peoples.

? Sustainable Use: in a rough estimation of socioeconomic benefits, the project increases net income within its direct beneficiaries in at least 7.5 million USD per year, on average increasing their net household income by 10%.

? Enhanced conditions for women participation will provide a much-sought relief in living conditions in project areas. Women's exodus, due to the harsh living conditions in degrading areas, and the societal perception of farm work being environmentally unfriendly, is one of the main characteristics explaining land carelessness.

? Adaptive Management: the participation of new stakeholders in the Provincial and National Action Plans reduces conflict and increases ownership and stewardship, and therefore contributes to the main aim of improving effectiveness and reducing the loss of productive land, biodiversity, and other natural assets.

Please see PRODOC 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, and Annex 2. Logical and Results Framework."

#### **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 19, 2023:**

1. In Annex E, the project budget table goes beyond the limit of the Portal page (on the right). Please adjust the table so that it fits entirely within the limits of the Portal page.
2. In Annex E, the Project Coordinator and the Financial Specialist should only be charged to the PMC, and not to the Project Components. Please adjust the budget accordingly.
3. Please see below specific comments on the other Annexes.

**December 7, 2023:**

1 and 2 Not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]
2. Done, PMU staff is now only charged to PMC

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue letters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. The Annex E be charger in the road map of the GEF portal.

**March 05, 2024 (Answer to the recommendation)**

5. a) corrected. b) Done. Component 4 (Evaluation and Monitoring) was incorporated into Table B and the budget was adjusted accordingly. c) Corrected, the indicated budget template has been taken. d) Corrected.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 19, 2023:**

1. In the Project Results Framework, the expected result for the GEF core indicator 4.3 is 21,000 ha whereas it is 60,000 ha in the core indicators section of the Portal entry. Please correct with consistent numbers.
2. In the Project Results Framework, the expected result for the GEF core indicator 1.2 is 134,727 ha whereas it is 113 ha in the core indicators section of the Portal entry. Please correct with consistent numbers.
3. In the Project Results Framework, the expected result for the GEF core indicator 11 is 15,000 whereas it is 15,260 in the core indicators section of the Portal entry. Please correct with consistent numbers.

**December 7, 2023:**

We don't see the comments are addressed. Please address this comment.

**December 15, 2023:**

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
2. Not addressed. The GEF core indicator 1.2 is still 113 ha in the core indicators section of the Portal entry while it should be 134,727 ha. Please correct the number in the core indicators section of the Portal entry.
3. Not addressed. In the Project Results Framework, the expected result for the GEF core indicator 11 is still 15,000 whereas it is 15,260 in the core indicators section of the Portal entry. Please correct with consistent numbers.

**January 16, 2024:**

- 2 and 3. Thank you for addressing the comments with consistent numbers. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. GEF Core Indicator 4.3 receives two separate contributions within Output 2.2.1: the mentioned one of 21.000 ha, plus immediately above another one of 39.000 ha. The sum of both provides the 60.000 ha number in the Core Indicators worksheet.

2. Done, the Portal entry now is 134.727 ha [PORTAL]

3. Done, the Portal entry now is 15.000 [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue letters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. The are different activities that al contribute to the same indicator.

The following text has been reviewed: "Indicator 2.2.1 Area of productive systems under sustainable land management (hectares).

Target Core Indicator 4.3. 39,000 ha

Target: Tucuman

Sustainable Land Management with small and medium local producers (Cuenca Marapa, 4000 ha, 200 beneficiaries)

Entre R?os

- Terraced reservoirs. Avoid water degradation by improving the quantity and quality of productive soils (5000 hectares)

- Sustainable Land Management (30,000 ha)

Indicator 2.2.1 Area of restored degraded agricultural land (hectares). Forest surfaces restored by climatic events (floods, droughts) and anthropic actions (fire)

Target Core Indicator 4.3: 21,000 ha

Target: Tucuman

Investment Plans (Marapa San Ignacio Sub Basin, 4000 ha)

Sustainable Land Management with small and medium local producers (Cuenca Marapa, 2000 ha)

Entre R?os"

#### **December 19, 2023:**

1. N/A

2. It was sdjusted, the core indicator 1.2 is 134,727

3. It was adjusted, the core indicator 11 is 15,0000

#### **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

#### **October 19, 2023:**

1. The climate risk analysis needs to be further elaborated as mentioned above.

2. We don't find the specific risk analysis and measures for pandemics. Please provide a summary of the potential impact of pandemics on the project, and of the opportunities for the project to mitigate the impact of future pandemics.

**December 7, 2023:**

1. Partially addressed. Please address this comment.
2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**December 15, 2023:**

1. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]
2. Done [PORTAL]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in the page 40 and 41.

The following text has been reviewed: "

<b>RISK</b>	<b>Probability</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>
Variations in the exchange rate and macroeconomic conditions	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	<b>MEDIUM</b>	The institutional political coordination with the participation of the private sector may generate superior synergies to create productive integration chains and/or value chains. The GoA has special assistance programs for small producers according to their specific activities with which they can be assisted.
Weak financial capacity of large producer groups reduces their ability to access financing to adopt SLM practices	MEDIUM	LOW	<b>MEDIUM</b>	The project will develop a financial strategy that strengthens the availability of access to incentives and other financial mechanisms for beneficiaries with low financial capacity. The GoA has special assistance programs for small producers according to their specific activities, with which they can be assisted. Component 3 of the project will consider these mechanisms and their lessons learned.



RISK	Probability	Impact	Overall	MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>Pandemic or Epidemic situations make field activities difficult</p>	<p>MEDIUM</p>	<p>LOW</p>	<p>MEDIUM</p>	<p>Some areas of Argentina suffer epidemics of diseases transmitted by mosquitoes such as Dengue, for which it is possible to know the critical moments and adapt the activities. Clothing protocols, gadgets, repellents are applied. Likewise, if conditions of the Covid-19 pandemic return, national and provincial protocols and WHO standards are adopted. The formulation process has demonstrated that means are available for participative decision-making in the post-pandemic situation. Assumptions on tourism as a sustainable income source have been reviewed. The possibility of increased cost of certain inputs has been taken into account in budgeting. Key staff will receive specific training. The potential re-instatement of COVID-19 containment measures has been considered, and in that case, there is capacity for the works to be carried out remotely, by re-directing travel budget lines to support remote participation of underprivileged stakeholders. The role of local partners will be fundamental in such contingency, as they remain closer to the beneficiaries to provide support for their participation in case face-to-face meetings are not possible. The project will provide opportunities for the adoption of sustainable practices with special focus on marginal and underprivileged communities, giving a central role to good quality employment that will be created for vulnerable groups as these groups are the ones closer to the opportunities and to enhance the impact of employment policies and the recovering of social and popular economy. In addition, the project will contribute to</p>

RISK	Probability	Impact	Overall	MITIGATION MEASURES
				<p>women empowerment, decreasing the tension between labor market participation and unpaid care within households. The project will also enhance structural support to these opportunities through supporting enhanced institutional coordination and stakeholder engagement, fostering early warning mechanisms, and promoting local, circular value chains.</p>
Lack of adoption of the financial mechanisms provided by the beneficiaries	LOW	MEDIUM	<b>LOW</b>	<p>Component 3 of the project addresses the root causes of current financial mechanisms that do not support improved resilience of both ecosystems and people. In doing so, it will include an identification of the necessary levers of change within the economic and financial aspects of the current activity, including lack of guarantees, lack of banking, financial exclusion or other known sources of non-participation in innovative financial mechanisms for sustainability.</p>
Seeing the restoration/recovery of soils exceeds the execution time of the project and the confidence of the producers is lost	MEDIUM	LOW	<b>LOW</b>	<p>An intersectoral intervention in productive landscapes is promoted, incorporating from the early stages (PPG) producers and producer organizations, local governments and the private sector in the tasks of Planning, Direction and Management.</p>
Institutional changes at national and provincial level	LOW	MEDIUM	<b>LOW</b>	<p>An intersectoral intervention in productive landscapes is promoted, incorporating from the early stages (PPG) producers and producer organizations, local governments and the private sector in the tasks of Planning, Direction and Management. Strengthening inter-institutional governance favors ownership by institutions, helping to maintain, replicate, and expand SLM techniques beyond the life of the project.</p>

<b>RISK</b>	<b>Probability</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>
Low participation of women and indigenous peoples	LOW	MEDIUM	<b>LOW</b>	The Communication Strategy favors the connection of all the stakeholders of the project, contributing to their articulation in periods of change of authorities.
Lack of commitment from the private sector	LOW	LOW	<b>LOW</b>	For this reason, it is proposed to achieve a territorial alliance between the private sector, the government sector at the national, provincial and local levels and civil society according to the diagnosis made.
Climate variability and CC reduce the effectiveness of the practices implemented by the Project	LOW	LOW	<b>LOW</b>	The project strengthens a sustainable land management (SLM) approach within and indirectly beyond the intervention sites, with the expected impact of increasing resilience to climate variability and climate change in both ecosystems and the population, and against both droughts and floods, which are the main risks identified derived from climate scenarios. Therefore, project interventions will be designed taking into account these characteristics of the future climate, and precisely with the objective of incorporating them into government and private planning. Under shorter timeframes, the GoA has special assistance programs for agricultural emergencies and disasters that will be enhanced through project activities, thus increasing the resilience of target populations. These project activities cannot be thwarted by climate variability.

"

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 19, 2023:**

The comments from GEF Council (USA, Germany and Canada) are not addressed. Please address these comments.

**December 7, 2023:**

We don't find the responses to GEF Council comments. Please address this comment.

**December 15, 2023:**

This comment is not addressed. Please address this comment.

**January 16, 2024:**

Partially: Germany's comment about considering linking to ongoing global initiatives working on related objectives, such as GEO LDN, and the use of Tools like LUP4LDN is not addressed. Please address this comment too.

**January 31, 2024:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

[XXX]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue letters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in the pages 59 and 60.

The following text has been reviewed: "**Annex B: Response to Project Reviews** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion, and responses to comments from the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

At PIF review, the following items were highlighted for further development/confirmation at PPG stage:

GEFSec comment	Response
<b>Climate impacts.</b> The GEFSec recommended a deep analysis of foreseen climate change impacts to be undertaken during the design phase, so to ascertain what implications that impacts could have for project outputs and outcomes.	That analysis was carried out and is presented in the Climate Risk Screening Summary annexed to the ESMF (ProDoc's Annex 10). Project output has been designed with these elements in consideration, so it provides mitigation for the foreseen impacts without risking the outputs themselves.

<p><b>Pandemics.</b> The GEFSec recommended an elaboration on the impact of pandemics on the project, and the analysis of opportunities for the project to mitigate the impact of future pandemics.</p>	<p>Specific risk analysis and measures for pandemics and their impact in project activity (in particular travel and gatherings), its feasible impact on the start of project execution, and any project opportunities to mitigate the impact of future pandemics, have been taken into account and included in project design.</p>
<p><b>Indigenous peoples.</b> GEFSec indicated the need to develop specific measures related to indigenous peoples' participation in the project.</p>	<p>A full review has been undertaken to identify indigenous peoples participating in the project, which finetuned it to presence in the Copo National Park. The National Park will coordinate activities with these communities with the National Institute for Indigenous Peoples Affairs (INAI) to carry out a formal FPIC process for the activity with these communities. Key reference: GEF Principles and Guidelines for Engagement with Indigenous Peoples</p>
<p><b>Gender considerations.</b> Both GEFSec and STAP underscored the need to carry out a full gender-perspective analysis.</p>	<p>This has been done during the design phase, showing that gender dynamics in the territories is deeply ingrained within the socioecological dynamics that underpin land degradation in these landscapes. Minimum women participation has been set up in each project activity within a very difficult setting of women fleeing these rural areas due to harsh living conditions and deeply ingrained <i>machismo</i>.</p>

STAP comment	Response
<p><b>EWS.</b> STAP recommended that a closer look was applied to Early Warning Systems, and their capacity to provide forward information to vulnerable populations.</p>	<p>All project intervention sites are equipped with EWS both for deforestation and extreme climate events, and Component 1 has been designed with this feature in sight.</p>
<p><b>Gender considerations.</b> Both GEFSec and STAP underscored the need to carry out a full gender-perspective analysis.</p>	<p>This has been done during the design phase, showing that gender dynamics in the territories is deeply ingrained within the socioecological dynamics that underpin land degradation in these landscapes. Minimum women participation has been set up in each project activity within a very difficult setting of women fleeing these rural areas due to harsh living conditions and deeply ingrained <i>machismo</i>.</p>
<p><b>Clarify objectives, Assumptions in outcomes.</b> STAP recommended that objectives and assumptions were further developed.</p>	<p>Specific attention has been devoted to do so during project design, that reflects in the project's logical framework and results framework.</p>
<p><b>Coordination with other projects, Other, non-GEF projects in Argentina.</b> STAP recommended to look for opportunities to exchange knowledge with other, like-minded projects in the intervention area.</p>	<p>This has been systemically tackled through the design of knowledge management mechanisms that are located within project governance, instead of as separate devices. These mechanisms are in turn situated within the National Action Plan's governance mechanism under the aegis of MAyDS, therefore as central as possible for the project purpose. Key Reference: Knowledge management and learning: a STAP brief</p>

**ToC, Behavioural mechanisms Component 2, Monitoring tools.** STAP recommended that behavioural mechanisms were considered for Component 2 activities.

This recommendation has been incorporated in both Component 2, Component 3, and in wider terms in the Project's Theory of Change, which relies in the combination of stimulus at different levels (normative, pilots, economic opportunities) to achieve change at scale.  
Key Reference: STAP Behavior Change Interventions in Practice: A synthesis of criteria, approaches, case studies & indicators  
Key Reference: STAP Information brief: Achieving transformation through GEF investments

"

### December 19, 2023:

All comments from USA, Germany, and Canada (GEF Council) have been addressed. A separate table for 'Council comments' has been included in Annex B: Response to Project Reviews.

1. The project does not promote or apply mandatory LDN targeting. All measures and targets included have been voluntarily proposed by local agents, and will be undertaken by these actors with incremental support from the project.
2. The synergy potential has been systemically tackled through the design of knowledge management mechanisms that are located within project governance, instead of as separate devices. These mechanisms are in turn situated within the National Action Plan's governance mechanism under the aegis of MAYDS, therefore as central as possible for the project purpose. Key Reference: Knowledge management and learning: a STAP brief.
3.
  - i) The project contributes to the NDC of Argentina, by helping to avoid deforestation of native forests by reducing emissions associated with deforestation; and by supporting the implementation of conservation and sustainable management plans, promoting recovery and restoration, to maintain the extent and condition of forests, reducing emissions associated with degradation.  
It does so within the framework of the UNCCD National Action Plan, which is to say in a coordinated manner.
  - ii) Project design included a participatory phase that was carried out during 2023, with the input of public and private institutions from the 3 provinces. More than a hundred persons participated from more than forty institutions. Representatives of three levels of Government (Central, Departmental and Municipal) attended, including MAYDS, environment and agriculture departments from the three provinces, Community-based Organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations and entrepreneurs. Male participation came to 50%, and female, 50%. Beneficiary populations for the project, as well as audiences for each output to be produced under participatory methods, have been identified.
  - iii) The incorporation of SDG 2.3.1 has been considered for inclusion within the project's logical framework and/or results framework. Unfortunately, production volume data are not gathered during national statistical operations (Censo Nacional Agropecuario), and asking for them at the individual level would make participation in project activities undesirable. Therefore, a decision has been made to measure project outcomes in area, avoided emissions, and beneficiaries. Other indirect indicators will be sought for the restoration of ecosystem services, included in Argentina's Soil Information System and Integrated Environmental Information System (SInIA in its Spanish acronym).
  - iv) The national forest monitoring system (Sistema Nacional de Monitoreo Forestal de Bosques Nativos de la Republica Argentina, <https://www.argentina.gob.ar/ambiente/bosques/monitoreo-bosques-nativos>) includes the

monitoring of forest area in line with FAO's FRA. Although the measure is dependent on factors outside the control of the project, and therefore has not been included in the results framework, the national forest monitoring system is included within the Argentinian public facilities with which the project coordinates actions and knowledge management.

**January 24, 2024.**

The project's monitoring mechanisms are placed within the National Action Plan's governance mechanism under the aegis of MAyDS, which will keep reviewing existing international/regional initiatives to participate in those which show potential to enhance national LDN efforts. Progress and inputs for the various initiatives may be reported during project implementation.

#### **STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 19, 2023:**

For a clear presentation, please address separately in 3 different tables the comments made by GEF Secretariat, Council and STAP.

**December 7, 2023:**

Thank you for separating the comments from GEF and from STAP. Cleared.

Agency Response Done. Separate tables present comment-response lines for each.

#### **Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

#### **Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

#### **Answer to te recomendations**

**March 6, 2024:**

3. For some reason this comment is still not addressed. Please address this comment.

The budget provided in Annex E does not contain any level of details on the description of the activities funded by the GEF. As an example, we can't assess what "Contractual Services" Individual entails so can't review the eligibility of expense. We would kindly suggest CAF to

use the budget template provided in the Project Cycle guidelines, this would allow us to review the budget appropriately.

**Agency Comment**

**March 8, 2024**

Thank you for your patience, we have incorporated the ESS table in point 11.

**March 6, 2024:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment above in the "Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)" box and the following comments:

1. The budget in Annex E is not readable in the Portal. This is the version Council members can see and which can be converted and consulted as a pdf document. Please make this annex readable (note: the first column under each component is not necessary and the detailed description of the expenses can be placed under the category of expenses).

**Agency Comment**

**March 8, 2024**

Thank you very much. The budget was presented in the CEO Endorsement document in a readable format.

2. The detailed description of the Consultants needs to have some level of detail. Currently it only says, "National consultants, selected through competitive process, to produce Outputs". At CEO endorsement we expect a little more, specially that these costs sum up to \$710,850 so almost 30% of the project budget. Please provide some details on what kind of consultancies these will be.

**Agency Comment**

**March 8, 2024**

The requested detail was incorporated in the budget table

3. \$275,159 for organization of workshops represent a significant expense being more than 10% of the project budget. Please provide a bit more details on what is the plan for how many activities?

**Agency Comment**

**March 8, 2024**

Done. Please see detailed budget.

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

**Agency Response**

**Status of PPG utilization**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 10, 2023:**

Out of \$91,743 (PPG without fees), \$6,000 remain unspent but committed. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 19, 2023:**

1. In Annex D, the map goes beyond the limit of the Portal page (on the right). Please adjust the table so that it fits entirely within the limits of the Portal page.

2. Please copy the geo location information in the appropriate table as below:

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION				
<small>The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location &amp; Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as <a href="#">OpenStreetMap</a> or <a href="#">GeoNames</a> use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <a href="https://coordinates-converter.com">https://coordinates-converter.com</a> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking <a href="#">here</a>.</small>				
Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**December 7, 2023:**

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

**December 15, 2023:**

1. Thank you for adjusting the maps. Cleared.

2. This comment is not addressed. Please address this comment.

**January 16, 2024:**

2. Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done [PORTAL]

2. Done [PORTAL, datos en Coordenadas.docx]

The response and modification has been uploaded to the GEF portal with blue characters and highlighted in yellow to facilitate its location. Find in the page 29.

The following text has been reviewed: "1b. Project Map and Geo-Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

Name	Coordinates	
	Latitude	Longitude
Copo National Park	-25,844	-62,032
Pre-Delta National Park	-32,1375	-60,646
Santa Ana Provincial Reserve	-27,476	-65,808
Intervention Area (Santiago del Estero)	-26,189	-65,586
Balderrama sub-basin (Tucuman)	-27,237	-65,448
Marapa sub-basin (Tucuman)	-27,6785	-65,3102
Ensenada basin (Entre R?os)	-32,088	-60,483

December 19, 2023:

1. N/A
2. Completed in the item "geo location information. Thank you.  
"

**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

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 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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 20, 2023**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments indicating exactly where the changes have been made and when it is a text modification or addition, highlighting these changes in yellow. In addition, to facilitate the review process, please remove the repeat uploaded annexes in the Document tab and complete the name of all the annexes with a clear name (not only number) indicating what the annexes are about.

**December 7, 2023:**

Not yet. Nearly none of the comments appear addressed in the Portal entry. Please ensure all the comments are addressed in the next resubmission and take into account the cancellation date of this project is very close on December 22, 2023. **THE RESUBMISSION IS NOW VERY URGENT AND THERE WILL MOST LIKELY BE NO TIME FOR A NEW ROUND OF GEF COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSE.**

**December 15, 2023:**

Not yet. Many comments have not been addressed. **Please ensure all the comments are addressed before resubmitting the project. There is most likely no time anymore for a new back and forth between GEF Secretariat and the Agency before the cancellation of the project.**

**January 16, 2024:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

**February 23, 2024:**

Not yet. Checking alignment with GEF policies revealed the need to address the following comments. Please address them and upload in the document tab of the Portal a document clarifying where and how these comments were addressed (as the review sheet doesn't allow to respond under this "Recommendation" box).

1. On Gender: The GAP has identified the challenges women face in rural areas. To address these, please ensure in addition to women's engagements, that policies, plans and financial mechanisms developed are gender-responsive. Please reflect gender perspectives in Outputs 1.1.3 , 2.1.2, 2.2.1, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. With respect to development of knowledge products and M&E. Please ensure to capture and disseminate good practice and lessons learned from a gender perspective and monitor and report on the Gender Action Plan.
2. On Stakeholder Engagement: The project provides information on stakeholder consultations during project development and outlines a stakeholder engagement plan with special attention to indigenous peoples and women. However, the submission does not include any details on specific IP, women or Civil society groups consulted and planned to be engaged during project implementation. Please provide further details on these specific groups and organizations, including producer organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
3. As mentioned above under the Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) section, the comment is not addressed (repetition to be removed). Please address this comment.
4. On table A: please include the focal area outcomes elements that are currently missing.

**A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS**

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
LD-1-1		GET	650,667.00	6,158,030.00
LD-1-2		GET	650,666.00	6,160,526.00
LD-1-4		GET	650,664.00	6,160,526.00
LD-2-5		GET	671,380.00	6,492,650.00
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>			<b>2,623,377.00</b>	<b>24,971,732.00</b>

5. On the budget:
  - a. As mentioned above, there are still inconsistencies between the budget provided in Annex E and the GEF project financing numbers in Table B. Please ensure the numbers are consistent throughout the project description.
  - b. Please include a component line, in table, B specifically for activities related to M&E.
  - c. The budget provided in Annex E does not contain any level of details on the description of the activities funded by the GEF. As an example, we can't assess what ?Contractual Services ? Individual? entails so can't review the eligibility of expense. We would kindly suggest CAF to use the budget template provided in the Project Cycle guidelines, this would allow us to review the budget appropriately.
  - d. The audits should be charged to the PMC and not to M&E. please correct accordingly.

Annual Audits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>Auditing firm hired by PMU after no objection from CAF</li> </ul>	12 000	At least annually
Monitoring visits to project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU</li> <li>Stakeholders</li> </ul>	13 300	At least annually
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST, EXCLUDING STAFF TIME AND CAF STAFF TRAVEL		74 400	

**March 6, 2024:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment above in the "Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)" box and the following comments:

1. The budget in Annex E is not readable in the Portal. This is the version Council members can see and which can be converted and consulted as a pdf document. Please make this annex readable (note: the first column under each component is not necessary and the detailed description of the expenses can be placed under the category of expenses).

2. The detailed description of the Consultants needs to have some level of detail. Currently it only says "National consultants, selected through competitive process, to produce Outputs". At CEO endorsement we expect a little more, specially that these costs sum up to \$710,850 so almost 30% of the project budget. Please provide some details on what kind of consultancies these will be.

Component Outcome Output	Detailed Description	
<b>Contractual Services - Individual</b>	National consultants, selected through competitive process, to produce Outputs	50,937
<b>Contractual Services - Company</b>	National consultancies, selected through competitive process, to produce Outputs	90,000
<b>International Consultants</b>	International consultants, selected through competitive process, to produce Outputs	-
<b>Local Consultants</b>	National consultants, selected through competitive process	146,568

Expenditure category

3. \$275,159 for organization of workshops represent a significant expense being more than 10% of the project budget. Please provide a bit more details on what is the plan for how many activities?

**March 8, 2024:**

The Agency addressed the remaining comments. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/20/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/7/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/15/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/16/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/8/2024</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**