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

GEF ID:	**5820**		
Country/Region:	**Argentina**		
Project Title:	**Promoting the Application of the Nagoya Protocol on ABS**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5339 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$908,904**
Co-financing:	**$3,307,186**	Total Project Cost:	**$4,216,090**
PIF Approval:	**May 22, 2014**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Santiago Carrizosa**

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**?	5-4-13 Yes. Argentina is eligible for funding. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	5-4-13 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for $1,050,000 dated April 29, 2014. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA

*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)
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	5-3-14 Yes. This project will funded by the NPIF. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	5-4-14 BD-4, Aichi Target 16. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	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?	5-3-14 Yes. See details on page 15. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
Project Design	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?	5-3-14 Yes. See details on page 8 and 9. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	5-3-14 Please simplify the Project Framework. There are far too many outcomes and outputs making difficult to visualize what the project is actually going to do	5-5-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Component 1. There are far too many outcomes and outputs, and the descriptions are too lengthy, especially for the Project Framework (Table B). Consolidate or reduce all these outcomes and outputs to be able to understand the project at a glance. The information in the text (p.11) is fine and does not need reduction. Component 2. Please reframe the title of this component to reflect the conservation of the Guanaco populations and habitats in the context of the articles of the NP (Article 9 - Contribution to Conservation and Sustainable Development), rather than the GEF BD strategy on mainstreaming. Component 3. There are far too many outcomes (6) for the number of proposed outputs (4) and most of the outcomes are outputs. Please reduce the number of outcomes to 1 or 2. Please clarify who the users and providers of genetic resources are. The description of the component may benefit by simplifying the description of the scientific work carried out and to be implemented as part of the GEF project. 5-21-14 These issues were properly addressed in the revised version. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	5-3-14 Yes. See page 10. Cleared.	5-5-16 It is not clear how the project will contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. There is reference to ".....access to scientific information relevant to conservation and sustainable use of guanacos". What about investing in the conservation of the species and their habitat?
	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?		5-5-16 Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	5-3-14 Yes. Details in Component 2 and 3. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	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)	5-3-14 Yes. See details on page 14. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	5-3-14 See pages 14-15. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is	5-3-14 Please elaborate on Innovation, Sustainability (financial and institutional) and potential for scaling up	5-5-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	5-21-14 These issues were properly addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		5-5-16 Cleared
	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?		5-5-16 Cleared
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?	5-3-14 Yes, especially considering that there are $2.3M in cash. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	5-3-14 UNDP co-financing is rather small. What are the chances of increasing the co-financing during PPG. 5-21-14 This issue was addressed in the revised PIF Cleared	5-5-16 All LoC included in the submission. Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	5-3-14 Yes. 5%.	5-5-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	5-3-14 Yes. It is $50K. Cleared	5-5-16 Cleared
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		5-5-16 No. The TTs were not included.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		5-5-16 Cleared
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?**	5-3-14 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 7, 13, and 17.4 5-21-14	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		5-5-16 No. Please address issues under items 8 and 21. Please check the Total Project Cost in Table B. It says $908,904. The sum of the values in the table gives us. 5-18-16 Cleared
	First review*	May 04, 2014	May 05, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 21, 2014	May 18, 2016
	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.**