



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

GEF ID:	5338		
Country/Region:	Argentina		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Production Practices of Small Producers to Protect the Biodiversity of High Value Conservation Forests in the Atlantic Forest, Yungas and Chaco		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4829 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,620,000
Co-financing:	\$21,687,400	Total Project Cost:	\$26,457,400
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Helen Negret

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 ?	April 1, 2013 CBD: Argentina became Party to the Convention September 03, 1993.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 1, 2013 Letter dated March 12, 2013 available from G Conesa.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	April 1, 2013 At 04/01/13 BD resources remaining to be allocated were \$5,439,410. Resources are available.	

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>April 1, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the PIF is well aligned with BD FA results framework and identifies contribution to Aichi Targets 3, 5 and 7 together with indicators in Table B to track progress.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>April 1, 2013</p> <p>The PIF supports key elements of the NBSAP.</p>	
	<p>6. 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?</p>	<p>April 1, 2013</p> <p>Yes, baseline is well prepared. Key to this is the Forest Law which provides resources to provinces for forest governance and for compensatory payments for land holders whose land comes under restrictive planning requirements.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	April 1, 2013 Yes, well described outcomes with indicators and clear expected outputs. By the time of CEO Endorsement more detail is expected on the role of the private sector in developing supply chains and market demand.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	April 1, 2013 The key GEB is the sustainable management of 200,000 ha of HCVF surrounding PAs in line with approved management plans; second is the increased connectivity and reduced impacts on an additional 1 million ha of productive landscapes through adoption of sustainable practices.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	April 1, 2013 IPs, CSO, and local communities are briefly mentioned in the PIF. This is sufficient at PIF stage but further details are expected of how these groups will be engaged are expected at CEO Endorsement.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	April 1, 2013 Sufficient information provided at PIF stage. At CEO Endorsement please provide a fuller consideration of the potential risks and mitigation measures with regards to coordinating within and between sectors and ministries, as well as	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		developing sufficient market demand for these products.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	April 1, 2013 Yes, the project links to the Rural Corridors and Biodiversity Conservation, Establishment of Incentives for Conservation and the regional Gran Chaco projects. Fuller details of how this coordination will be achieved are expected at time of CEO Endorsement.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	April 1, 2013 Although NTFP use is widespread the commercialization of these through supply chains improvement and the development of market demand is innovative and can build on the experience of other products such as timber. Sustainability is based around the assumption that the alternative being provided is financially more attractive to land users and that the market will support the additional costs of these improved working practices. This is underpinned by the Forest Law. The potential for scaling up is good as these are only pilot sites with supportive existing conditions; it could be replicated across other regions. Please fully examine the economic assumptions by the time of CEO endorsement.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	April 1, 2013 Financing and cofinancing amounts appear appropriate and adequate for the activities.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	April 1, 2013 Cofinance is \$21,687,400 a ratio of 1:4.69, of which 97% is cash cofinance. UNDP's contribution is \$500,000 cash cofinance. In order to ensure support from the private sector it would be prudent to ensure cofinance from the private sector by time of CEO Endorsement.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	April 1, 2013 PMC is at 5%.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	April 1, 2103 Yes, PPG is approved.	
20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	April 1, 2013 There is no NGI.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	April 1, 2013 Yes. This project is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	#7 Role of private sector in supply chain development and market demand. #10 Engagement with indigenous peoples, CSOs and local communities. #11 Risk and mitigation measures with regards to coordination within and between sectors and ministries. #12 Coordination with existing projects and activities. #13 Please fully examine the economic assumptions by the time of CEO endorsement. #17 Cofinance from private sector.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 02, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.**