GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**5112**		
Country/Region:	**Argentina**		
Project Title:	**Governance Strengthening for the Management and Protection of Coastal- Marine Biodiversity in Key Ecological Areas and the Implementation of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF)**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$3,534,786**
Co-financing:	**$17,813,206**	Total Project Cost:	**$21,347,992**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**April 01, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Alejandro Flores**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	September 19, 2012 Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	September 19, 2012 Yes in a letter dated July 16, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	September 19, 2012 Yes FAO has demonstrated expertise and experience in all aspects of the project and at all levels of the organization that will be involved in the implementation of this project.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	September 19, 2012 No.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	September 19, 2012 It appears so, but please clarify at country level staff technical and supervision capacity for this project including staff numbers. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	September 19, 2012 Yes. Argentina has $9.3 million remaining.	
	• the focal area allocation?	September 19, 2012 Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	September 19, 2012 NA.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	September 19, 2012 NA.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	September 19, 2012 NA.	
	• focal area set-aside?	September 19, 2012 NA.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	September 19, 2012 Yes, clearly aligned.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	September 19, 2012 Yes.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	September 19, 2012 Fully aligned with the NBSAP and relevant fisheries policy and legislation.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	September 19, 2012 No, please clarify in a revised proposal after the project design is reconsidered in light of the considerable overlap between the components one and three of the PIF and the three ongoing GEF projects which are active in the same thematic space. See comments under question 19 below about the three overlapping projects. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	September 19, 2012 Please describe the ongoing baseline investments and projects that are not existing GEF projects currently under implementation or completed as these can not be considered baseline projects. This should be framed under the thematic and geographic areas of investment: fisheries management,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		marine and coastal protected areas management, invasive alien species management, policy. The GEF projects that are described here and that are currently under implementation should not be presented as baseline projects but should be described under the section on coordination with other related initiatives. Please also see comments under coordination with other initatives as we are concerned about duplication of investment and a total lack of coordination with the other GEF agencies working in the country and in this thematic space. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	September 19, 2012 Until the baseline (as noted above) and the distinct added-value of this investment when compared with the ongoing investments are clarified it is not possible to assess the cost-effectiveness of this investment.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	September 19, 2012 Yes but there appears to be considerable overlap between outcomes 1 and 3 and ongoing GEF projects. See comments under question 19 below. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	September 19, 2012 Given that the proposal has presented existing GEF projects as part of the baseline, the methodology for describing the incremental benefits is not appropriate. Please revise the description of incremental benefits once the baseline description is amended per the recommendation above. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	September 19, 2012 The benefits listed will actually be provided by many GEF projects involved in the same topics and that are under implementation. Please focus this description on the activities of this project and its added value only.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	September 19, 2012 A list of potential stakeholders is provided, however, it appears that key partners--other GEF projects in particular and the executing agencies of these projects--have not been properly consulted as the overlaps between components one and three are considerable. Please clarify. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	September 19, 2012 Please discuss how the project will take into account consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	September 19, 2012 No. The project has not been well coordinated with three major GEF initiatives in the country and hence there is considerable overlap between the proposed PIF and the three projects.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FAO is the GEF agency for the project "Strengthening of governance for the protection of biodiversity through the formulation and implementation of the National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (NSIAS)". This is a comprehensive project focused solely on IAS management control that is still under the design phase. This project can not be part of the baseline for this proposed GEF project. Furthermore, we are quite concerned that the proposed project will deal with one invasion pathway of IAS when the project that has been already approved was designed to implement a strategy that is meant to address the invasion pathways for all IAS. Furthermore, the GEF is funding the Globallast Partnerships Project in which Argentina is one of the lead participating countries in which the focus is on management of ballast water to prevent transport of IAS, among other objectives. Therefore, between these two significant investments on IAS management it is very difficult to see justification for further investment in IAS management at this time. Second, UNDP is implementing a project that is being executed by the NGO Fundacion Natural Patagonia entitled: "Inter-jurisdictional System of Coastal-Marine Protected Areas (ISCMPA)". The proposed PIF overlaps with many of the activities	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		within the approved project and we see no evidence of colloboration or coordination on the part of FAO to ensure that what is being proposed in the new PIF is indeed additional. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	September 19, 2012 The current project design presents considerable difficulties with regards to implementation and execution arrangements as we see considerable overlap with approved projects under implementation or in the design phase and very little coordination. Please revise this section when a revision of the project is completed. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	September 20, 2012 Upon a revision of the project design removing duplication with other GEF investments, an assessment of project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		management costs will be conducted.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	September 20, 2012 Given the duplication of effort with the other GEF projects working in the same thematic space the financing for component one seems excessive and the funding for component three is duplicatory. As the project is revised, please adjust all funding accordingly. February 11, 2013 Adequate response provided.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	September 20, 2012 The cofinance is adequate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	September 20, 2012 Cofinacing is adequate.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	September 20, 2012 The UNDP has raised signfiicant issues	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		with regards to project overlap and lack of coordination in the project design phase which echo the analysis provided herein by the GEF Secretariat. Please respond to these comments when sending back the revised project.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	September 20, 2012 No. Components one and three of the proposal as presented overlap considerably with three GEF projects under implementation or in the design phase as referenced above in question 19. Component two of the project on fisheries appears to add the most value to the ongoing GEF investments in the coastal and marine environment environment, however we note that the UNDP GEF project (Inter-jurisdictional System of Coastal-Marine Protected Areas) also deals with the fisheries sectors to some degree. There appears to have been very little coordination or communication between the FAO-lead design process and the three projects and thus the current design presented does not appear viable. The GEFSEC would be available for a bilateral with FAO on the current design to assess the feasability of revising it given the concerns expressed in this	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		review sheet. February 11, 2013 The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 11, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.