GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9955**		
Country/Region:	**Argentina**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening Argentina's Transparency Framework on GHG Inventories and Mitigation**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,999,800**
Co-financing:	**$350,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,399,800**
PIF Approval:	**January 16, 2018**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Geordie Colville**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	MGV, November 22, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, November 22, 2017: Yes, the project is consistent with Argentina's national strategies and plans, including its NDC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	MGV, November 22, 2017: Yes, the PIF identifies the main barriers and gaps identifies in the process of	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	fulfilling its commitments and implementing its long-term climate change strategy.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, November 22, 2017: All the elements to answer this question are in the PIF, but we would suggest to further summarize and clarify the incremental reasoning of this CBIT project under Part 4 including how it responds to the gaps identified, builds on the existing baseline, and will specifically work in coordination with other previous and current efforts (LECB, FCPF, REDD+, 3rd BUR, and 'Advancing from Mitigation Ambition to Action'). In addition, please clarify who is funding and/or implementing this last project. MGV, December 28, 2017: Incremental reasoning has been expanded. Comment cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, November 22, 2017: We note that there are no activities relating to sharing of knowledge, experiences and best practices outside of the country, particularly through the Global Coordination Platform. Please consider and add a relevant project output. MGV, December 28, 2017: An output on peer exchange has been added. Comment cleared.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, November 22, 2017: Yes, the project will not involve indigenous peoples, but it will involve CSOs and include relevant gender elements.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, November 22, 2017: The project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, November 22, 2017: The project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	MGV, November 22, 2017: The project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund. There are resources available to support this project.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, November 22, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments on 4 and 5. MGV, December 28, 2017: Comments have been addressed. P.M recommends CEO Approval.	
Review Date	Review	November 22, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 28, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.