



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

GEF ID:	5044		
Country/Region:	Argentina		
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Use Management in the Drylands of North-west Argentina		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4841 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-1; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,515,091
Co-financing:	\$19,730,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,245,091
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	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?	July 31, 2012 Yes, Argentina is an eligible country. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	July 31, 2012 Yes, the OFP endorsement is on file. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	July 31, 2012 Yes, UNDP is well placed as GEF Agency for the project based on description provided.	

*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)
		Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	July 31, 2012 Yes, including staff capacity with experience from existing and previous GEF projects related to natural resource management. Cleared	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	July 31, 2012 Yes. The project will utilize LD resources available under the country's STAR allocation. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	July 31, 2012 Yes. The total of \$3,960,600 endorsed by the OFP (including Fees and PPG) is within the LD allocation. Please have the OFP endorsement letter revised to reflect this total so that the same letter can be referenced for the PPG request. September 4, 2012 The LoE is now correct and reflects both project amount and expected PPG	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		request. The total endorsed is now \$3,970,000. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	July 31, 2012 No focal area set-asides are being requested. Cleared	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	July 31, 2012 Yes. As a LD stand-alone investment, the project is aligned with the focal area results framework. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	July 31, 2012 Yes, the project will contribute to LD1 through focus on livestock and rangeland management, and LD3 through potential up-scaling of integrated land management practices across wider dryland landscapes. Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	July 31, 2012 Yes, and the consistency is highlighted for both the existing NAP and relevant	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	national strategies. These should be further elaborated during project development to include specific deliverables that will be addressed by the proposed investments. Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	July 31, 2012 Yes. The project will specifically target institutional strengthening and stakeholder capacity building as a core component of the proposed approach. The potential for contributing to project sustainability will need to be more clearly articulated during project development. Cleared	
Project Design	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?	July 31, 2012 The project seeks to address land degradation problems in dryland provinces of North-west Argentina, and provides a very clear articulation of the need to target the region. However, the baseline as described focuses mainly on the broader contextual issues rather than planned or existing initiatives in the targeted geographies that will be leveraged by the proposed investments. Furthermore, there is no clear rationale for the proposed "long-term solution" (para 17) to build a framework. Please provide: a) a more succinct explanation of the baseline in the targeted geographies,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>including existing or planned investments in relevant sectors</p> <p>b) a more clear description of the proposed framework, with data and assumptions as appropriate.</p> <p>September 4, 2012</p> <p>The baseline is now clear, including a more clear explanation of existing and planned investments to be leveraged by GEF resources.</p> <p>Cleared</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>No. In the absence of a baseline relative to the targeted geographies, the incremental reasoning is not very clear. Based on how the baseline is addressed, please provide a clear reasoning for the GEF incremental funding.</p> <p>September 4, 2012</p> <p>The GEF incremental reasoning is now clear, and planned use of GEF resources fully justified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>While the two proposed components are justified, it is not clear how the outcomes and outputs will be streamlined to integrate across scales (landscapes to provinces to region to national). For example, for component 1, it is stated that at least 3 provinces will be targeted for SLM (para 20) while a parallel effort will target multi-sectoral and stakeholder to facilitate dialogue and coordinate SLM (para 21). Please clarify how proposed actions within the components are related to demonstrate a coherent framework, including justification for the GEF incremental funding.</p> <p>September 4, 2012</p> <p>It is now clear that the project framework is based on a "nested and heirarchical" approach, which will enable achievement of outcomes at multiple scales, with potential for scaling-up. This is consistent with the need to build on planned government investments to ensure sustainability of the project outcomes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>A range of "expected" benefits are identified based on proposed SLM alternatives to be put in place by the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project. These are largely generic, however, and it is not clear how they are linked relative to the target geographies. Please provide a more concrete set of incremental benefits relative to the targeted geographies, including consideration for monitoring and measuring during project implementation.</p> <p>September 4, 2012</p> <p>The benefits are now clear and should be refined during project development, with measureable targets established for inclusion in the focal area tracking tool.</p> <p>Cleared</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>July 31, 2012</p> <p>The description of socio-economic benefits is clear, including gender dimensions. It is not clear, however, how these benefits will support the delivery of targeted environment benefits relative to the geographical contexts. Please clarify.</p> <p>September 4, 2012</p> <p>More specific details on role of beneficiaries in supporting the delivery of GEBs is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</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 indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>Yes. Role of specific stakeholders including CSOs has been identified, and should be taken into consideration during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	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)	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>Yes, relevant risks have been identified, but need to be further elaborated during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>Several existing initiatives have been identified for coordination, but specific details on areas for coordination should be elaborated during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>July 31, 2012</p> <p>While relevant stakeholders and their roles have been presented (section B.5, page 12), there is no specific description of accountability lines for execution of the project. Please elaborate on how the execution arrangement builds on roles and responsibilities of stakeholders identified, including UNDP.</p> <p>September 4, 2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, and accountability lines are now clear, and consistent with the execution arrangement. 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?		N/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	July 31, 2012 Yes. The total for PMC is \$1,153,885 with GEF contributing only \$167,385, which is about 5% of the GEF grant. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	July 31, 2012 The proportional allocation of both the GEF grants and co-financing is appropriate, but the adequacy of GEF financing will depend on incremental reasoning. For example, under component 1, only four outputs will focus specifically on SLM practices on-the-ground. It is not clear how \$2.175 million will be invested to generate targeted environmental benefits at appropriate spatial scales. Please address. September 4, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The breakdown of GEF financing is now justified on the basis of planned investments within the nested approach. Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	July 31, 2012 The indicative co-financing amounts to \$19.730 million for a ratio of 1:5.6, which is appropriate. Please ensure all co-financing letters are provided at time of CEO endorsement. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	July 31, 2012 Yes. UNDP will contribute \$0.5 million as grant for the project. Cleared	
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?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being	July 31, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	recommended?	PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address all concerns raised in this review. September 5, 2012 The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program	
	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*	July 31, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 04, 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	3. Is PPG approval being	

Recommendation	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.