

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

Basic Information

GEF ID

10866

Countries

Argentina

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

CAF

Agency ID

CAF: CAF-GEF 034

GEF Focal Area(s)

Land Degradation

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response No response needed.

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. The component 2 includes significant investment on the ground but the 'Financing Type' for that component is informed as 'Technical

Assistance". We understand it should be 'Investment' instead. Please amend accordingly or justify the choice of the financing type.

2. Mitigation of climate change is mentioned in the project title and 8 times in table B while the Rio Marker 'Climate Change Mitigation' at the beginning of the project description is tagged with a '0'. It should be '1' to be consistent with the project. Please amend accordingly.

3. To better understand the contribution of each component, please add under the outcomes column of table B relevant indicators and targets.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. It should have been 'Investment'. The typo has been amended.

2. The Mitigation marker should have been tagged '1'. The typo has been amended.

3. The indicators had been included in table B, but were somehow lost in the uploaded version. The revised version should now correctly include them.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

Please correct the sources of co-financing from Gobiernos de la Provincias de Tucuman, Santiago del Estero and Entre Rios. As they have been categorized as "Other" please change for "Recipient Country Government". Please also present these as "Government of" (in English).

Recipient Country Government	Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos – Instituto Nacional de Asuntos Indígenas – (INAI)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	114,797.00
Other	Gobierno de la Provincia de Tucumán	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	349,044.00
Other	Gobierno de la Provincia de Santiago del Estero	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,073,622.00
Other	Gobierno de la Provincia de Entre Ríos	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,211,092.00

October 25, 2021:

This comment is not addressed. Please address this comment.

November 2, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

the sources of co-financing from Local Governments have been corrected

Agency Response (1st, Nov, 2021)

The classification as 'Other' of these three local governments has been corrected. The entities should now be correctly identified as 'Government of ...'.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

Please fill in the blank Agency name in table D in Portal PIF entry:

D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
	GET	Argentina	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2,623,377	236,104	2,859,481.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					2,623,377.00	236,104.00	2,859,481.00

October 25, 2021:

This comment is not addressed. Please address this comment.

November 2, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

Done.

Agency Response (1st, Nov, 2021)

Done. It should now appear correctly.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, the budget requested for this project is \$2,959,481 while the remaining STAR envelope is \$3,002,534.17. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, the requested LD fund of \$2,959,481 is lower than the remaining LD resources of \$2,995,289.76. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, the PPG requested is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. We recognize this is an ambitious project, however, the core indicator targets seem unrealistically high, especially for the core indicator 3 (area under Restoration). Please refer to the GEF guidelines which indicate that the targets need to be directly attributable to the project (including co-financing) and not resulting from indirect benefits (except for climate change mitigation). Please revise all the core indicators accordingly and justify the calculation of the targets based on recognized reference of cost.
2. The core indicator 6.1 includes significant indirect benefits which appear high. Please provide the methodology used for the calculation of GHG emissions avoided and consider that the benefits in the project area deriving from the project activities and until 20 years after the project begins should be counted as 'direct' benefits (not 'indirect').

October 25, 2021:

1. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.
2. The expected GHG emissions mitigated remains very high and the methodology and calculation leading to such result is not presented. Please 1- consider a more conservative approach with a lower expected result (unless this result can be justified and demonstrated) and 2- present clearly the methodology used and calculation applied to obtain such result (the Agency may want to use a recognized tool such as the Ex-ACT tool).

November 2, 2021:

2. There is a mistake in the use of the Ex-ACT tool (the total duration of accounting is 0 years (instead of 20) and there is a typo reporting the result in the core indicator table of the Portal entry (the result reported is 6340.848 instead of 6,340,848 calculated in the Ex-Act tool). Please correct accordingly. Alternatively, considering this is a LD funded project, the Agency may prefer to remove this core indicator at this stage and propose to assess it at PPG stage.

January 3, 2022:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. Core indicator 3 (area under Restoration) has been reviewed to reflect only directly attributable expected results. All Core indicators have been reviewed and amended where needed.
2. Core indicator 6 (GHG emissions avoided) has been reviewed to adequately present expected benefits.

Agency Response (1st, November 2021):

2. Using the Ex-ACT tool (v. 9.2), the estimation is corrected to 6.340.848 tCO₂e. This figure has been included in Annex B and Table F

Agency Response (30th, Nov, 2021)

2. The mistake has been identified and amended. Sorry. After reviewing the complete Tool use, it now provides an estimation of 7.151.507 tCO₂e. This figure has been included in Annex B and Table F of the uploaded PIF document, and in the corresponding Portal entries.

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers

that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. The paragraph "The strategies proposed to achieve the objective are: ... and mobilization of resources (Component 3) for the sustainability of the intervention." should be under the alternative scenario section not under the problems description. Please amend accordingly.
2. This section presents the environmental problems in each of the targeted landscapes, which is good. But the root causes of these problems and the current existing barriers preventing involved stakeholders from implementing solutions are very vague or missing. Please complete the description with 2 different and clear sub-sections on 1- the root causes including stakeholders involved and 2- the current existing barriers. This is essential to demonstrate the relevance of and justify the proposed project activities.
3. In particular, we learn in the baseline scenario that there is already a strong national baseline and that 'there is currently a solid institutional base in Argentina, with a vast experience in the planning and management of the fight against LD, which provides efficient inter-institutional articulation and an effective administration and coordination of resources of different programs'. So, it is unclear why the first component aiming at, among others, the consolidation of the institutional political structure in charge of land-use planning and management, is needed. This section is lacking the presentation of what is needed at national and local level. Please clarify.
4. For all the acronym used in the project description, please make sure they are fully written the first time they appear. For instance, we don't know what 'PIECAS-DP' stands for.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments and complements. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. The paragraph has been moved to its correct position in the description of the proposed alternative scenario. It currently lays just before the Theory of Change diagram.
2. The section has been reorganized for clarity and legibility. It has been subdivided in Subsections have been added that explicitly present the root causes including stakeholders involved (1.3 Root causes and involved stakeholders), and the current existing barriers (1.4 Long-term solutions and current existing barriers).
3. The section has been reviewed to clarify the presentation of what is needed at national and local level. Specifically on Component 1, please review Barrier 1 in the above mentioned subsection 1.4.
4. The whole text has been reviewed for correct use of acronyms. Sorry.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. The baseline seems to be an exhaustive list of public institutions, policies and plans related to land uses and it is unclear how they relate in particular with the proposed activities. Selecting the most relevant baseline policies and interventions in the targeted project areas, please explain what concretely they will bring to the project and specifically to each of its components.
2. The presentation mentions some projects from the international cooperation such as the cooperation with IICA-CAF but it is unclear how these interventions can be linked to or can be useful for the proposed project in the targeted areas. Please clarify this aspect and ensure to include here all the initiatives from the international cooperation which are relevant in the project targeted areas.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. The baseline description has been thoroughly reviewed to better reflect the most relevant baseline policies and interventions in the targeted project areas and what concretely they will bring to the project and specifically to each of its components.
2. The presentation of projects has been streamlined to clarify how these interventions can be linked to or can be useful for the proposed project in the targeted areas.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. The Theory of Change is missing. Please provide a Theory of Change clearly showing the logical pathways from the environmental degradation leading to the solutions and taking into account the identified root causes and barriers that need to be addressed. The

proposed activities in the project must clearly address the identified causes and barriers. The Agency is invited to refer to STAP guidance

available here: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf.

2. The first paragraph of this section is a mix of incremental reasoning (what would happen without the project) and baseline scenario (government plans). Please move the sentences of this paragraph in the appropriate section.

3. The description is very general, not structured and is mainly a repetition of the table B. This section should provide more details about the project activities. Please organize this section with subsections corresponding to the project components/outcomes and under each outcomes, please elaborate describing the concrete activities proposed under each outcomes.

4. The component 3 seeks the design and implementation of innovative financial mechanisms. Nevertheless there is no further details and the kind of mechanisms remain unclear. This is a crucial element for the project success so please, elaborate further on the innovative financial mechanisms considered by the project developers and on what makes these mechanisms relevant in the project targeted areas.

October 25, 2021:

1. Thank you for providing a Theory of Change of the project. It is currently situated under the Component. Please place the TOC at the beginning of the Alternative Scenario and not within a particular component.

2, 3 and 4. Thank you for the improvements, clarification and additional information. Cleared.

November 2, 2021:

1. The TOC is still under Component 1. Please place the TOC at the beginning of the Alternative Scenario before Component 1.

January 3, 2022:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. The Theory of Change is now included within the amendment of the section.

2. The sentences in the first paragraph of this section have been moved to the appropriate sections.

3. This section has been reorganized with subsections corresponding to the project components/outcomes, and under each outcome a description of the concrete activities proposed under it.

4. The description of component 3 is elaborated further on the innovative financial mechanisms considered by the project developers and on what makes these mechanisms relevant in the project targeted areas.

Agency Response (1st November 2021)

1. Agency placed the TOC at the beginning of the Alternative Scenario

1. Amended. The ToC should now be correctly placed

Agency Response (30th, Nov, 2021)

1. Re-amended. The ToC should now be correctly placed

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

The description is unclear. Please explain for each of the LD Focal Area objectives (LD 1-1, LD 1-2, LD 1-4 and LD 2-5) how the proposed project is aligned.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

The description now explains, for each of the LD Focal Area objectives (LD 1-1, LD 1-2, LD 1-4 and LD 2-5), how the proposed project's outcomes and outputs contribute to the corresponding specific objective.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. Without a clear identification of root causes and barriers, and with baseline scenario not clearly related to the project, it is difficult to assess the incremental reasoning. By completing the previous sections (problems, baseline and alternative scenario), please make to present in this section how the proposed activities build on and articulate with the exiting baseline.

2. The description is unclear: under the title "Component 2...", the paragraph begins with "GEF funding under LD-2-5 (Component 1)". Please explain.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification and amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. With root causes and barriers, and baseline scenario, now more clearly presented in the previous sections (problems, baseline and alternative scenario), this section has been amended to clearly explain how the proposed activities build on and articulate with the existing baseline.
2. The description has been amended.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

As mentioned above, all the expected targets appear high considering the investments. Referring to the 'GEF guidelines on core indicators and sub-indicators' (https://wwfgeftracks.com/sites/default/files/2019-04/indicators_0.pdf), please revise the targets and explain how they are estimated.

October 25, 2021:

Please refer to the remaining comment above on the expected result in terms of climate change mitigation.

November 2, 2021:

Please refer to GEF Sec response above. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

All core indicators have been reviewed to strictly follow the 'GEF guidelines on core indicators and sub-indicators'.

Agency Response (1st November, 2021)

(As above) Using the Ex-ACT tool (v. 9.2), the estimation is corrected to 6.340.848 tCO₂e. This figure has been included in Annex B and Table F.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. We understand Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector Entities have been consulted. If it is the case, please indicate a 'Yes' in front of each category at the beginning of this section.
2. Please provide a short summary of the results of the consultations with the stakeholders.
3. The last paragraph 'Preliminary to this task ... in other aspects' is unclear. According to the paragraph, it seems that the mapping of stakeholders, consultation of interested parties, identification and roles of key actors have not been done yet, which appears the contrary of all what is presented just before. Please explain.
4. In addition considering the project objective and proposed components it seems logical that IPLC and CSOs should have been consulted in project design. The project, however, indicate that none of these groups have been consulted. Please provide information on any consultations with these important stakeholder groups and if none have been carried out to provide more concrete justification why not.
5. Please describe the profile of the targeted beneficiaries and in particular of the targeted producers and land users (their size, their products, their organization...)

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification and complements provided. Nevertheless, a very important part in the previous version of the PIF has been

removed and is now missing: It is the description of "how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement". Please include again all these paragraphs, beginning with "Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MAyDS): it will...." until the paragraph "Preliminary to this task ... in other aspects" (18 paragraphs).

November 2, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. Amended. The corresponding boxes are now ticked. IPLCs and CSOs have been indirectly consulted at this stage through the corresponding second-level organisations that participate in the above mentioned processes. Formal, direct FPIC processes will take place once an appropriate formulation phase ensues.
2. The requested summary has been included.
3. Amended. The paragraph has been edited to hopefully avoid its misunderstanding.
4. A complete profile of the targeted beneficiaries is now included.

Agency Response (1st November, 2021):

The eighteen paragraphs have been recovered, reviewed for clarity, and are now included back

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

1. Please move the paragraphs under 'Indigenous People:' from the Gender section to the Stakeholder section or justify their current location in the Gender section.
2. The category 'closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources:' is not checked. Please confirm this category is not

relevant for this project.

3. It is concerning that this project does not include more indicative information on gender dimensions related to the project objective and components. This project is about climate resilience, improving productivity, equity and environmental quality in forestry and agri-food system. There are important gender dimension that should have been considered early in project design. The project should, at this stage, already have identified some preliminary measure to ensure that gender issues are addressed. Please further elaborate on gender dimension relating to the project objective and context as well as provide some information (apart from plans to carry out a gender analysis in PPG) on indicative gender responsive measures linked to the project components.

October 25, 2021:

1. The first paragraph of this section is about indigenous people. Please explain the relation with gender issues and how clarify it contributes to provide the information expected in this gender section. Please consider removing it if it is a mistake.
2. Thank you for the amendment and clarification. Cleared.
3. This comment is partially addressed in the project description and it is not addressed in the review sheet (there is no response number 3). In particular, please further elaborate on the current gender context relating to the project objective in the targeted landscapes and clearly link envisioned indicative gender responsive measures with the project components and activities.

November 2, 2021:

- 1 and 3. Thank you for the amendment and complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. Done.
2. The category 'closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;' is not checked as the project will not address tenure issues of land and forests.

Agency Response (1st November 2021):

1. The paragraph has been removed as it does not contribute to provide the expected information
3. The section has been thoroughly reviewed and further elaborates on the gender context in Argentina, the project provinces, and the project sites and links the intended measures with project Components and Outputs

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

The description mainly explains that the private sector is necessary and will be consulted during the PPG phase to further define its role but we don't know what kind of engagement and from whom is expected at this stage. To clarify the private sector role in the project, please provide a summary presenting for each targeted category of private stakeholders what is their expected engagement to achieve the project objectives.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. If possible, please readjust the columns which are not aligned for the last 5 rows of the table.

November 2, 2021:

Thank you for the format improvement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

A table presenting, for each targeted category of private stakeholders, what is their expected engagement to achieve the project objectives, is now included.

Agency Response (1st November, 2021)

Done

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

1. The climate risk is not enough analyzed. At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please briefly outline 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 list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.
2. In the proposal, the risks analysis related to the COVID-19 pandemic is very general only stating that national and provincial protocols and WHO regulations would be adopted. Nevertheless, the pandemic can affect important elements of the project. The main risks need to be identified and an opportunity analysis needs to be undertaken at this stage. For instance, in addition to the infection risks and people safety measures, risks related to the availability of co-financing and expertise may exist. Shouldn't all these risks be considered? Please complete the risk analysis and consider eventual opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (it can be a specific separate note after the risk table). For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14, 2020.
3. The risk of the lack of adoption of the financial mechanisms by the beneficiaries is not considered. Shouldn't it be included in the risk analysis?

October 25, 2021:

1. Thank you for the additional analysis. Cleared.
2. Partially. The description is very succinct and out of 5 sentences, the first 3 ones are very general or does not explicitly related to the COVID-19 crisis. The note just after the risk analysis table needs to be clarified and completed (please list all the potential risks during project design and implementation) and their respective mitigation measure for each of these risks. In addition, please organize the description in 2 clearly distinct parts: one about the risks and the other one about the opportunities provided by this project to mitigate the risks.
3. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

November 2, 2021:

2. Thank you for the improvements. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

1. The climate risk screening summary is now annexed (Annex D). Sorry.
2. A specific separate note has been added to identify the main risks and present the respective opportunity analysis with respect to COVID-19 and future pandemics.
3. The risk 'The weak financial capacity of large groups of producers reduces their ability to access financing to adopt SLM practices' analyses the more feasible cause for such a risk to materialize. Nonetheless, the risk of lack of adoption of the financial mechanisms by the beneficiaries has been separately included in the risk analysis.

Agency Response (1st November 2021):

2. The note has been clarified and completed, and now includes two separate parts referring to risks and opportunities

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

We understand the project execution is under the Directorate of External Financing Projects of the Ministry as outlined in section 6.
Coordination of the Portal entry:

6. Coordination

Outline the institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Argentina has a solid institutional structure at national level for the execution of this project. Coordination from the DNP/OAT (its acronym in Spanish) of the MADS is foreseen in close relationship with the National Advisory Commission (CAN in its Spanish acronym) as an advisory body and with the ONDyD as an evaluation and monitoring body.

A Steering Committee for the project will be formed, made up of: the MADS; the representatives of the provincial governments; IICA representatives; representatives of the partners or other parties responsible for the project. the Implementing Agency CAF will sit in this Committee with no vote. This Steering Committee will provide general guidance to the Project Coordinator; evaluate project risks and progress, and provide recommendations to achieve the expected results.

The Project Executing Unit (PEU) will be made up of the National Director of the project (Secretary of Environmental Policy in Natural Resources of the MADS), an Alternate Director (National Director of Planning and Environmental Management of the Territory); a Project Responsible Consultant (General Coordinator), the technicians designated by the DNP/OAT, and an accounting and finance team that will work under the modality and guidelines of the Directorate of External Financing Projects (DIPROFEX) of the MADS. The PEU will be supported by consultants and facilitators temporarily hired to execute sequential activities within each of the components. The provinces will each designate a focal point who will be a counterpart in the project. The DNP/OAT of the MADS will carry out the responsibility of coordinating the Project.

However, under Part 1- Project Information, the executing partner is different from section 6 above:

Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ	Executing Partner Type
IICA	Others

Please clarify and ensure consistency in the provided information.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. To make it simpler and clearer at this stage, we recommend to let under "Other Executing Partners (s)" only the "Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development" which is the main Executive Agency and chose "Government" under "Executing Partner Type".

Partner Type".

November 2, 2021:

Considering IICA is not explicitly mentioned as executing partner, please follow the recommendation made in the previous review: please inform under "Other Executing Partners (s)" only the "Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development" which is the designated Executive Agency and chose "Government" under "Executing Partner Type".

January 3, 2022:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

The project information in part 1 has been corrected.

Agency Response (1st November 2021)

The project information in part 1 has been corrected following the received recommendation

Agency Response (30th, Nov, 2021)

1. Re-amended. The project information in part 1 and the corresponding Portal entry has been corrected following the received recommendation and should now correctly appear.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

1. The description is unclear regarding to the project content. Please clarify how concretely the knowledge management approach will be implemented through the project components (which deliverables through which activities) and how it will contribute to the project results and sustainability.
2. In addition, please provide information about: 1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan, 2) plans to learn from ongoing relevant projects and initiatives, 3) proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning and collaboration, 4) proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders, 5) a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability, and 6) plans for strategic communications.

October 25, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

The section has been reviewed to reflect the central role of knowledge management (KM) in this project, and reorganized in subsections for added clarity. In summary, the project’s KM approach is realized within Outcome 1.2, through i) the Communication Strategy (Output 1.2.1)

and ii) its training activities (Output 1.2.2).

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low and CAF attached the Matriz de Análisis Preliminar de Riesgos Ambientales y Sociales para Operaciones de Infraestructura, Desarrollo Social y Ambiental (Matrix of Preliminary Analysis of Environmental and Social Risks for Infrastructure Operations, Social and Environmental Development). The PIF recognizes indigenous peoples as stakeholders and states that "During the PPG stage, it will be relevant to contemplate from the beginning the different worldviews of indigenous peoples and rural communities among other actors in the territory." However, it is not clear what the preliminary identified environmental and social risks related to indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities are in the three water basins regarding access to forest and agricultural activities. While it is fine that the Screening document is in Spanish, please provide a short summary in English in the portal section and including any plans to carry out any additional environmental social risk assessments or and management plans (including FPIC process, if it is necessary).

October 25, 2021:

Not addressed. We don't find the ESS supporting document (this section provides the climate risk screening document and the document titled "E&S risk preliminar assessment LD Argentina" in the previous PIF version has disappeared) and there is no response about the indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities. Please:

- 1- Provide the ESS screening supporting document (instead of the climate risk screening);
- 2- Address the comment raised above on the environmental and social risks related to indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities in the three water basins (including the short summary in English).

November 2, 2021:

2. Not addressed. Please present what the preliminary identified environmental and social risks related to indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities are in the three water basins regarding access to forest and agricultural activities. While it is fine that the Screening document is in Spanish, please provide a short summary in English in the portal section and including any plans to carry out any additional

environmental social risk assessments or/and management plans (including FPIC process, if it is necessary).

January 3, 2022:

Thank you for the consideration. We note that the risk is rated as "Medium/Moderate" in the Portal entry, but in the ESS supporting document, it is said to be "categorized as 2C, "Low Environmental and Social Risk" and the box checked corresponds to "Category D. Without environmental and social risk". This is confusing... Also, please note that the climate risk analysis should be considered under the risks section of the Portal entry while the ESS risks refer to the environmental and social risks and potential impacts of the project implementation. Please ensure the risk rating is clarified and the ESS fully analyzed during PPG. Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

A Climate Risk Summary in English was include in the GEF PORTal as a document-Roadmap section.

Agency Response (1st November 2021)

1. The ESS document (with the climate screening summary attached) is now uploaded.
2. Its conclusions and recommendations cover all the raised issues (climate change, indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities). The section on conclusions and recommendations is now included in English

Agency Response (30th, Nov, 2021)

1. The ESS document (with the climate screening summary attached) is now uploaded.
2. Its conclusions and recommendations cover all the raised issues (climate change, indigenous peoples and vulnerable communities). The section on conclusions and recommendations is now included in English in both the document and the corresponding Portal entry.

art III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 23, 2021:

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the current country's GEF OFP. Cleared

Agency Response

Agency Response (20th, Oct, 2021)

No response needed.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 29, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

October 25, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

November 11, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

January 3, 2022:

Thank you for considering the comments. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	9/29/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/25/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/3/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval