



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

GEF ID:	4861		
Country/Region:	Argentina		
Project Title:	Introduction of energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in design, construction and operation of social housing and community equipment		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1; CCM-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,281,838
Co-financing:	\$44,538,475	Total Project Cost:	\$54,820,313
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	David Elrie Rodgers	Agency Contact Person:	Carlos Ludena

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?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	DER, March 21, 2012. NA
	• focal area set-aside?	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	DER, March 21, 2012. a) This project will focus on CCM1, Technology Transfer, and CCM2, Energy Efficiency. The energy efficiency alignment is clear. In order to better understand the alignment with CCM-1, please clarify if there are any TT mechanisms (e.g. N-S or S-S cooperation, licenses purchase, etc.) that will be used by the project? Is the project proposing something different from wide-scale dissemination of proven and available technologies? Please clarify. b) However, the expected FA outcomes and FA outputs language in Table A of the PIF is different from the required language identified in the template documents. Please refer to GEF5-Template Reference Guide 9-14-10rev11-18-2010_0.doc and update	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Table A accordingly.</p> <p>DER, April 5, 2012.</p> <p>a) The response discusses the focus on ensuring that innovative low-carbon technologies are demonstrated and deployed on the ground, consistent with the CCM-1 objective. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) The table has been modified to incorporate the required outcomes and outputs. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Yes. There is a strong component on dissemination and replicability.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Yes. There is a strong baseline project to improve social housing across the country.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Please address the following comments for each of the components:</p> <p>1. Low-carbon social housing pilot projects designed and demonstrated (investment)</p> <p>a) Construction of pilot units showcasing EE and RE is very critical, however the cost seems very high (almost \$60,000 per unit). Please describe the size of the units. The GEF financing cannot be used for the construction of 480 units for the control group; nor can it be used for basic construction costs not related to energy- -these should come from co-financing. Please clarify the cost for constructing the units, along with incremental costs for the technology packages and training.</p> <p>b) We do not understand the need for construction in this project of control units since software tools, models, and data collection for reference buildings is widely available. Please clarify.</p> <p>c) We do not clearly understand the incremental nature of the pilot units. It would be more clear if the baseline project addressed all of the construction of social housing units; while the GEF incremental funding goes for the application of EE and RE technologies to the pilot units as well as other components.</p> <p>d) Output 1.1.4: Training of occupants for maintenance sounds overreaching.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Countries that promote EE and RE equipment require professionals to undertake maintenance tasks and certify the equipment.</p> <p>e) Please clarify the types of RE technologies to be studied and included. Will these be limited to solar thermal heat and solar PV? Solar cooling technology can be very expensive and lower performance so please clarify.</p> <p>2. Carbon monitoring for pilot technologies</p> <p>f) The monitoring program is very important. Consider using internet based tools for real-time monitoring and data collection, such as those in use by the U.S. based Building America program.</p> <p>g) Consider working closely with local utilities to ensure that existing data collection efforts can be integrated and not duplicated.</p> <p>3. Adoption of regulatory framework at national level regarding EE and RE in social housing</p> <p>h) We find the funding level for this component to be very low, both the GEF financing and the co-financing. Please justify how this level will be sufficient. The development of the regulatory framework will have a longer-lasting impact than pilot demonstrations. Therefore this component needs to have sufficient funds to deliver strong results in a timely manner. Please re-allocate some funding from other components to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this component.</p> <p>i) The component 3.3 on GHG emissions is out of place. Remove it.</p> <p>j) The International Code Council has already developed a strong set of building code materials that include targets for achieving 30% improved energy efficiency in multiple climate zones. Also, significant published material available from BREEAM, USGBC (LEED), IEA, CLASP and others are available to help adapt and articulate building codes for Argentina. Do not delay development of regulatory framework until after the pilot phase but begin regulatory development in parallel.</p> <p>4. Building expert capacity for local/regional production of EE and RE technologies</p> <p>k) We see some duplication of effort in the training of local actors in component 1 and in component 4. Please clarify.</p> <p>5. Outreach and dissemination</p> <p>l) The public information campaign can be a very important part of the effort to help residents adopt energy efficiency practices. However, the design does not seem to match the audience. Are workshops the best way to reach this audience? Are web-based platforms with data, materials, and technology database really targeted at residents? Please clarify the audiences for this component. consider working with the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>local utilities to help develop and disseminate promotional materials.</p> <p>DER, April 5, 2012.</p> <p>a) The explanation of the approach for the full costing of the 120 pilot units answers some questions but still needs more detail. As an accounting mechanisms the GEF can be flexible to accommodate the IDB approach. However, during the project design phase, it will be critical to identify the inclusive incremental differences in costs between the upgraded units and the business as usual units to articulate a better explanation at the CEO endorsement. Also, during project design, ensure that provisions for construction of the pilots provides opportunities for contractors to learn the new design approaches.</p> <p>b) Thank you for clarifying that the co-financing will be used for the control units. comment cleared.</p> <p>c) See comment a. Cleared at the PIF stage but please address at endorsement.</p> <p>d) Clarification is helpful. Comment cleared.</p> <p>e) Clarification is helpful. The project emphasis on passive designs and avoiding solar air conditioning is valuable. Comment cleared.</p> <p>f) Thank you for considering the use of modern data collection technologies in the project design. This could add a strong innovative feature to the Argentina effort. Comment cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>g) Comment cleared.</p> <p>h) Thank you for the clarification and we are pleased that regulatory efforts can be low cost. Comment cleared.</p> <p>i) Comment cleared.</p> <p>j) Comment cleared. During project design, it will be beneficial to estimate with precision the targets in various climate zones for energy savings improvement over these baseline codes.</p> <p>k) Comment cleared.</p> <p>l) Thank you for the clarification. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Please explain Table 2 on page 8. It appears to present a mixture of direct emissions benefits (for the 120 pilot units) and indirect emissions benefits for 54,000 units that will adopt the new regulatory framework over a 10 year period.</p> <p>DER, April 5, 2012. Thank you for separating the direct and indirect emissions benefits estimates. At CEO endorsement, we expect a more detailed analysis that shows the staging of emissions benefits based on the expected build schedule for the 54,000 units.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	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)	DER, March 21, 2012. Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DER, March 21, 2012. There is a significant effort regionally and globally to adopt stronger building codes that address EE and RE technologies. During project design phase, these efforts should be identified for additional coordination. DER, April 5, 2012. Comment cleared.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	DER, March 21, 2012. No. a) The executing agency arrangement is not adequately described. Please clarify. b) Also, please more clearly document the role of IDB in the project implementation. DER, April 5, 2012. Comments cleared.	
	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?	DER, March 21, 2012. The project management activities are not sufficiently described to justify the high	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		<p>cost. Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, April 5, 2012. Clarifications are helpful. Comment cleared. At CEO endorsement, we expect to see clear justification for the project management costs and may recommend cost-savings.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012.</p> <p>a) Please see comments in box 14 and re-allocate more resources to component 3.</p> <p>DER, April 5, 2012. Re-allocation not needed. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. Yes. The national government co-financing is quite substantial. See box 26 on agency co-financing.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>DER, March 21, 2012. We are quite surprised that section C.1 on page 13 "co-financing amount the GEF agency is bringing to the project" is blank. Also, we see no IDB co-financing in Table C on page 4. Please explain the co-financing IDB is bringing to this project.</p> <p>DER, April 5, 2012. Agency co-financing has been increased. Comment cleared.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	DER, March 21, 2012. NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	DER, March 21, 2012. Not at this time. Please respond to the comments in boxes 8,14,15,19,20,23,24,26. DER, April 5, 2012. Yes. Comments cleared.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	DER, March 21, 2012. a) There is a significant effort regionally and globally to adopt stronger building codes that address EE and RE technologies. During project design phase, these efforts should be identified for additional coordination. DER, April 5, 2012. b) During the project design phase, it will be critical to identify the inclusive incremental differences in costs between the upgraded units and the business as usual units to articulate a better explanation at the CEO endorsement. Also, during project design, ensure that provisions for construction of the pilots provides opportunities for contractors to learn the new design approaches c) During project design, it will be beneficial to estimate with precision the targets in various climate zones for energy savings improvement over these baseline codes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		d) We expect a more detailed analysis that shows the staging of emissions benefits based on the expected build schedule for the 54,000 units. e) We expect to see clear justification for the project management costs and may recommend cost-savings.	
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*	March 21, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2012	
	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.