



**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT**  
**PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT**  
**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

<b>Project Title: Sustainable Land Use Management in the Drylands of North-west Argentina</b>			
Country:	Argentina	GEF Project ID:	5044
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4841
Other Executing Partner:	Environment and Sustainable Development Secretariat (SAyDS)	Submission Date:	April 2014
		Resubmission Date:	May 22, 2014
GEF Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Project Duration(Months)	60
Parent program	NA	Agency Fee (\$):	351,509

**A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK**

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF (\$)	Co-finance \$
LD 1	Outcome 1.2: Improved rangelands /livestock management.	1.2. Types of innovative SL/WM introduced at the field (1,000,000 ha/ rangeland)	GEF	1,171,697	8,028,458
	Outcome 1.3 Sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems	1.3 Suitable SL/WM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems (480,000 ha)	GEF	569,110	4,110,481
LD 3	Outcome 3.1: Cross- sectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape management (in support of SLM)	3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented (over 1,480,000 ha local level planning; 14,800,000 ha provincial level)	GEF	636,064	3,936,135
	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management adopted by local communities.	3.2. INRM tools and methodologies developed & tested 3.4 Information on INRM (SLM) technology and good practices disseminated over dryland ecoregions (30,000,000 ha)	GEF	970,835	3,748,700
Sub-total				3,347,706	19,823,774
Project management cost				167,385	982,080
Total project cost				3,515,091	20,805,854

**B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

<b>Project Objective:</b> Building a sustainable land management framework to alleviate land degradation; maintain ecosystem services and improve rural livelihoods in the drylands of northwest Argentina.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. SLM practices implemented to avoid and reduce soil degradation in the environmental hotspots of the three target arid ecoregions covering	TA	Uptake of SLM measures applied in 1,480,000 ha to avoid and reduce LD deliver benefits across 450,000 ha Puna; 750,000 ha in Dry Valleys Scrub; and 280,000 ha in Plains and Plateaus Scrub. These benefits include the following:  - Increase in equitable access to water as	<b>1.1 Guides/ protocols developed to support planning and implementation of SLM at the local level in the selected ecoregions and land degradation hotspots.</b> a) LADA methodology and vulnerability assessment applied to determine prioritized LD hotspots; b) 40 provincial and national technicians trained in use of LADA methodology; c) SLM guides and protocols developed to facilitate implementation of SLM practices; d) Management plans developed in specific areas to identify appropriate SLM practices and procedures; e) dissemination and	GEF TF	2,159,919	12,966,657

14,000 km <sup>2</sup>		<p>measured by % of small farms that access surface water for irrigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in the % of population with Unmet Basic needs compared to the national average (NatAv) Ranking values</li> <li>- 5% reduction in area with bare ground in 3 provinces</li> <li>- 5,000 families implementing at least 1 SLM practice</li> <li>- Level of cross-sectoral coordination capacity increases to at least 3 points on LD tracking tool</li> <li>- Revolving funds, small credit schemes and other financial instruments allocated \$10 million to productive sectors for SLM activities</li> </ul>	<p>awareness raising activities to increase appropriation of guides and protocols.</p> <p><b>1.2 Multisectoral committees promote dialogue on SLM and coordination of sectoral programs at the level of AGIs and guide the implementation of SLM guides/ protocols.</b></p> <p>a) Three (3) multi-sectoral committees established, one per province; b) Workshops carried out to increase understanding of SLM practices</p> <p><b>1.3 SLM practices are implemented in dryland ecoregions in critical LD hotspots.</b></p> <p>a) Participatory workshops and field-based evaluations to confirm Specific Intervention Sites and practices where is the actual practices; b) Extension and information dissemination with producers and key stakeholders to promote adoption of SLM practices and replication, in close coordination with relevant organizations.</p> <p><b>1.4 The allocation of financial resources for small farmers supports the continued implementation of SLM in priority areas.</b></p> <p>a) Economic valuation of SLM practices, taking into consideration economic, social and environmental issues; b) Confirmation of financial instruments to be modified/ developed to facilitate access to credit for small farmers, including revolving funds and microcredit; c) Development of guidelines with criteria for distribution of these resources; d) Dissemination of guidelines; e) Technical guidelines for commercial banks to facilitate access by medium-scale producers to credit for SLM.</p>			
2. Enabling framework to plan, monitor and adapt land management at the dryland ecoregional level	TA	<p>Strengthened SLM capacities at the provincial level increase LD avoidance, reduction and rehabilitation practices over the long term in 30,000,000 ha of dryland ecoregions. Measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 20% of farm households in hotspots and high risk areas of 75 % NW dryland provinces replicate best SLM and IEM practices by project end</li> <li>- 1,480,000 ha monitored with respect to implementation of SLM in 3 target</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.1 Geographic Information Systems (GIS) for the monitoring and evaluation of LD/SLM in the drylands of the 8 provinces.</b></p> <p>a) Protocols for metadata, including required information layers, information providers and associated responsibilities; b) Creation of provincial nodes linked to national node; c) Interinstitutional workshops to assess created information in provincial GIS systems; d) Provincial environment authorities, IDE nodes and ONDTyD on SLM/LD GIS M&amp;E system; e) SLM M&amp;E protocols developed; f) Decision makers awareness on utility of information tools.</p> <p><b>2.2 Provincial government institutions apply SLM practices.</b></p> <p>a) Provincial Action Programs developed in at least 3 provinces; b) Multisectoral</p>	GEF TF	1,187,787	6,857,117

		ecoregions - 100% staff involved in LD issues trained on SLM in the 3 sectors of environment, agriculture and hydrological management - At least 3 provinces develops Provincial Action Programs and begin to implement them - At least 2 baseline programs incorporate SLM and INRM criteria in operational manuals	committees from Output 1.2 expanded and institutionalized to guide PAP implementation, incorporation of SLM in sectoral programs, etc. c) SLM guides and protocols developed under Output 1.2 adapted to the 8 provinces' specificities; d) proposals for provincial norms developed, such as to formally adopt the PAPs or institutionalize the multi-sectoral committees. e) Multi-tiered training programs carried out with at least 150 professionals from environment and agricultural departments and other organizations, coupled with information exchange and knowledge management programs.  <b>2.3 National sectoral programs in drylands incorporate SLM practices.</b> a) Communication and advocacy strategy developed and implemented; b) Liaison to integrate SLM in operational manuals of at least 2 sectoral programs.			
Subtotal					3,347,706	19,823,774
Project management Cost (PMC)					167,385	982,080
Total project costs					3,515,091	20,805,854

#### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National government	SAYDS	Cash	963,733
National government	SAYDS	In-kind	472,028
National government	CONICET	Cash	1,038,000
National government	CONICET	In-kind	692,000
National government	INTA	Cash	1,062,937
National government	INTA	In-kind	349,650
Local government	Provinces	Cash	4,832,000
Local government	Provinces	In-kind	528,000
National government	Ministry of Agriculture	Cash	7,765,663
National government	Ministry of Agriculture	In-kind	2,601,843
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	500,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>20,805,854</b>

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	LD	Argentina	3,515,091	351,509	3,866,600
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>						

#### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	40,000	0	40,000.00
National/Local Consultants	690,082	1,100,161	1,790,243

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF**

**A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable**

No change.

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.**

No change.

**A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:**

No change.

**A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:**

1. There have been no changes in the problem the project seeks to address or in the baseline projects. The GoA is investing considerable resources through a number of baseline projects improving the livelihoods of the Cuyo and NOA geopolitical regions. These fall into three broad categories namely: Programs planned and funded as part of relevant national laws; Sectoral investments at the federal and provincial level many of which form part of the country's quest to increase sustainable production and fight against poverty. Institutional support for desertification-related work. Despite these investments in the current scenario these baseline projects fall short of their potential as they do not take into account the degree of land degradation that is already high in the associated ecoregions. Moreover as they are designed from a unisectoral stance, they do not address the growing pressures and competition for land and water. The result is that under the baseline the already high levels of land degradation will increase with ensuing loss of ecosystem goods and services. The maintenance of the current scenario without GEF funding will exacerbate land degradation in the dryland ecoregions of the NOA and Cuyo regions, increase vulnerability to the effects of land degradation and climate change, and limit the economic development of the smallholders dependent on water and soil resources. Farmers will continue to have limited access to knowledge and to funding mechanisms to promote sustainable land management and simultaneously maintain or increase productivity. This will fuel a vicious cycle of low production to support livelihoods, increased pressure on natural resources, and ultimately increased degradation and desertification risk. Limited multisectoral collaboration and institutional capacity to address LD will remain a problem under the baseline. In the context of multiple land uses and increasing baseline sectoral activities on highly vulnerable lands, there is an increased possibility of lack of coordination of different land uses under the baseline, which would exacerbate LD trends. Tools to guide SLM such as best practice manuals, harmonized GIS systems and provincial SLM programs will be unavailable. Baseline sectoral programs to reduce poverty, increase productivity and protect the environment will be insufficient as they do not integrate SLM considerations nor do they adopt a multisectoral approach. As a result, global environmental benefits as well as national/local development benefits will be limited.

**A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning:**

2. There have not been any substantive changes in the project design since the PIF stage. As outlined in the PIF, for Outcome 1, the project will implement SLM practices at the landscape (ecoregional) level in appropriate sites. These include a variety of SLM practices such as livestock management, crop management, water harvesting, among others; establishment of multi-sectoral committees; and development of financial instruments to support uptake. Some changes were made in terms of the activities to be carried out to achieve Output 1.1. Firstly, it should be clarified that land use planning in the Argentinean context refers to the management and implementation of SLM practices in appropriate areas and in ways to facilitate upscaling (it is not referring to territorial zoning). The LADA methodology and a vulnerability analysis that takes into account social factors will be applied to determine priority areas/ hotspots (Specific Intervention Sites or SEIs) selected different departments for direct project action to promote SLM. Local regulations will not be developed as part of this Output. This is because Outcome 1 is focused on implementation of SLM practices in three particular Geographic Intervention Areas (AGIs) in order to achieve on-the-ground impact during the time scale of the project. On further review it was determined that local regulations would not be developed and approved in time to

influence the local-level impacts being sought under this Outcome. However, proposals for provincial norms will be carried out under Output 2.2 as part of developing an enabling environment for SLM implementation. Since local regulations are governed by the provincial norms in place, the provincial norms will set the framework for the subsequent development of local regulations over the medium-term. An additional action has been added for this Output that was not highlighted in the PIF, i.e., the development of SLM manuals and protocols for each of the main Land Use Systems in the three AGIs. These will support SLM implementation in the SEIs. In addition, management plans will be developed in selected landscapes to identify and provide guidance on appropriate SLM practices for different degrees of degradation for LD avoidance and reduction. The modifications to the activities to be carried out under Output 1.1 do not affect the incremental cost reasoning for this project or change the costs associated with transforming the project from one with purely national benefits into one with clear global benefits. Please see paragraphs 187-189 of the Project Document for more details on the incremental cost reasoning associated with the project.

3. Outcome 2, the establishment of an enabling framework to plan, monitor and adapt land management at the ecoregional level, has not seen any significant changes. As was highlighted in the PIF, the project will develop a GIS-based LD/SLM system, implement a multi-tiered training programme, facilitate the development of Provincial Action Programs, develop proposals for provincial norms to strengthen regulatory frameworks, carry out an information dissemination campaign and integrate SLM in at least two sectoral programs. Please note that there have not been any changes in the distribution of GEF resources per Outcome. Significantly more details on all proposed activities, Outputs and Outcomes have been provided in the ProDoc.

#### **A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

4. There were some modifications made to the mitigation measures for risks identified at the PIF stage. In addition, some new risks were identified, as described in the following table.

<b>Risks</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>
Political changes at the different levels (national, provincial, municipalities) and changes in personnel may delay project implementation	Low/ Medium	The project will work with the national government as well as with provincial governments to increase their understanding and awareness of the effects of SLM on production and ecosystem services, and thus on the livelihoods and well-being of the populations. Thus it addresses an issue central to development goals and one likely to withstand changes in government. Nonetheless a Steering Committee at the political level will be set up, including high-level representatives of the provincial environmental authorities in the regions of NOA and Cuyo. This will strengthen project decision-making and ensure relevance and consistency with provincial priorities. In the event of changes in government, the project will sensitize decision makers or intermediate authorities (e.g., ministers) to familiarize them with the project and promote ownership of the project. Project activities will be undertaken within public organizational structures and will be anchored in cooperation agreements to increase continuity. Implementation arrangements have been agreed upon to ensure administrative efficiencies and expedite project execution. Furthermore, tools and policies will be developed, including SLM guides, protocols and PAPs, which will facilitate continued adoption of SLM practices despite possible changes in personnel.
Due to the difference in time scales between the political cycle and the ecosystem recovery cycle partners may not prioritize SLM policies.	Low	The project will carry out a communication and advocacy campaign with decision makers and other stakeholders to raise awareness about the benefits of SLM adoption and the importance of integrating SLM in national and sectoral programs and policies. In addition, through the project, a valuation of the costs and benefits of SLM practices will be carried out, which will feed into the communication and advocacy campaign as well as into the financial instruments to support SLM adoption. The establishment of multi-sectoral committees, development of Provincial Action Programs that are linked to the NAP, and the mainstreaming of SLM into sectoral programs will also contribute to the continued prioritization of SLM issues over time.
Institutional rigidity and resistance to inter-institutional and multisectoral collaboration	Low to Medium	During the PPG phase, joint meetings, consultations and workshops were held with the environment and production departments of the target provinces (particularly the three provinces being targeted under Outcome 1). These discussions pave the way for continued inter-sectoral collaboration during project implementation. Given that limited inter-institutional collaboration is an important restriction that has undermined a multi-sectoral approach to reducing LD in the past, the project will support the establishment of multi-sectoral committees

Risks	Ranking	Proposed Mitigation Measures
		to guide the development and implementation of SLM protocols and promote integration of SLM criteria in funding instruments (Output 1.2). These multi-sectoral committees will form the basis for the broader multi-sectoral committees to be established under Output 2.2 to guide the development and implementation of Provincial Action Programs. These multi-sectoral committees will be formally established to ensure their long-term continuity. In addition, the specific institutions that will participate in project implementation have provided letters of intention at the PPG stage with co-financing figures. More detailed agreements with specific commitments will be established once the SEIs and practices to implement therein are confirmed.
Barriers to reform of baseline programs	Low/ Medium	The project will work closely with stakeholders from the baseline programs through multi-sectoral committees and workshops in order to revise the operational manuals in use that guide resource allocation. The development of the PAPs will also facilitate the revision of baseline investments to incorporate SLM.
The number of players and difficult decisions needed for up-scaling SLM may delay field application of the measures proposed by the project.	Low/ Medium	Project coordination mechanisms will include participatory decision-making and seek to facilitate consensus, early detection of areas of insufficient coordination and constructive dialogue. The project will set up multi-stakeholder committees to improve intersectoral coordination and consensus on SLM at landscape levels. The GIS based data will provide access to information and increased clarity on trade-offs among different land uses thus facilitating decision making. The project will also establish institutional roles and responsibilities vis-a-vis SLM at the provincial level through the development of SLM protocols and will provide training and awareness on SLM practices and their benefits, again facilitating the achievement of consensus among the diverse stakeholders.
Local communities are not sufficiently encouraged by direct benefits and thus reluctant to adopt behavioral changes needed to achieve goals in the long-term	Low	The areas of intervention for SLM up-scaling and activities will be identified through participatory workshops to ensure a high level of involvement and interest within local communities. The project will also operate through key community stakeholders thus raising the level of readiness for cooperation of the entire local community (farmers and their families, teachers, local opinion formers, etc.). The project's communication strategy and training components will also raise awareness of the benefits of SLM adoption. The SLM practices to be promoted are based on existing practices in place within the communities, with some modifications to increase their productivity and reduce their impact on LD, thus increasing the likelihood of support for adoption. All of the SLM practices that have been pre-selected (which are subject to confirmation during the project) have been assessed in terms of their associated costs to ensure that their implementation is feasible with the project resources available. Furthermore, the project will carry out a thorough valuation exercise to determine the magnitude of the benefits versus costs of different SLM practices. It should also be noted that by mainstreaming ongoing baseline projects, communities will have increased support for SLM practices in the medium and long term.
Changing climate and meteorological conditions may affect adaptation measures implemented during the project.	Low/ medium	The targeted drylands are high altitude fragile environments in which current harsh climatic conditions are exacerbating human-caused land degradation. These drylands are already experiencing increased extreme climatic events that are projected to increase still further. As highlighted in Argentina's Second Communication to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (2007), climate change projections for the NW include reduced precipitation and increased temperatures, with concurrent increased evapotranspiration and water demand. The SLM practices to be promoted and up-scaled will support adaptation to climate change by promoting more efficient water use and increased productivity.

#### A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

5. The information on GEF initiatives included in the PIF remains valid. Additional relevant initiatives with which the project will coordinate were identified and included in the ProDoc. The Adaptation Fund is funding the project "Increasing Climate Resilience and Improving Sustainable Land Management in the Southwest of the Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina" (2014-2019), which adopts the same strategic approach as the drylands project in terms of the definition of AGIs and SEIs. Both this project and the drylands project are being implemented by the DCSyLCD of SAYDS, which will facilitate interactions and synergies between the two projects.

6. The various GEF projects described in the PIF are, or were, led by the Under-Secretariat of Environmental Planning and Policy of SAYDS. To facilitate coordination and information exchange, SAYDS will hold biannual workshops and annual work plans will be shared for the ongoing projects to maximize efficiency. These workshops will be conducted to

coincide with the review of the AOPs and at the mid-year mark. In addition, permanent joint mechanisms will be established with key stakeholders, who will coordinate information exchange, the calendar of activities, and revisions to the AOPs.

7. The project will also ensure information sharing with the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) in Argentina, which provides funding for projects to reduce land degradation, among other focal areas. For example, the SGP funds projects involving silvopastoral and agroforestry systems, live fences, wind breaks, terraces and associated training to protect soils. While the SGP may not be funding projects in the particular ecoregions involved in the drylands project at this point because it is currently focused on the humid areas of the NE region, the project will facilitate communication to learn from SGP's previous and current experiences of working with local organizations in the promotion of SLM practices. The drylands project also commits to sharing project outputs with the SGP program.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

### **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

<b>STAKEHOLDER</b>	<b>RELEVANT ROLES</b>
Secretariat of the Environment and Sustainable Development (SAyDS)	SAyDS is charged with the development and implementation of environmental policy at the national level. It coordinates the national government's environmental policies and establishes the strategic environmental policies and programs, with the goal of promoting social, economic and ecological sustainability through regional strategies. Through its Directorate for Soil Conservation, SAyDS will undertake the role of Executing Agency. In addition to executing the project, SAyDS will also be involved in a number of project activities, including, among others: support for the application of the LADA methodology and vulnerability assessment to confirm the SEIs; coordination with MAGyP and MECON to develop proposed guidelines for the incorporation of SLM in bank credit lines; design of a communication and advocacy campaign; and cooperation with national sectoral programs to integrate SLM in sectoral planning and investments.
Environment authorities of provincial governments: Jujuy, Salta, Catamarca, Mendoza, Tucumán, San Juan, San Luis, La Rioja	The environmental authorities are key stakeholders for this project and will take a lead role in a number of project activities, including among others: the development of the SLM guides and protocols and the implementation of a communication strategy. They will participate in the multisectoral committees to support implementation of the SLM guides and protocols, help channel funds from sectoral programs to SLM activities, and strengthen coordination among sectoral programs and policies. Together with other members of the multi-sectoral committees, the environment authorities will also play an important role in the development of Provincial Action Programs. They will support the development of proposals for provincial norms to adopt the SLM guides and protocols, PAPs and/or to formalize the multi-sectoral committees. In general, they will provide oversight of project interventions in their territories. They will also benefit from different project activities, such as training in the use of the LADA methodology for the evaluation of LD; training on IDE and M&E protocols, and training on SLM and INRM.
Agricultural authorities of provincial governments	The agricultural authorities of provincial governments will contribute to various project activities, including the development of SLM guides and protocols, development of Provincial Action Programs and implementation of the communication and awareness strategy. They will participate on the multi-sectoral committees to strengthen intersectoral coordination, promote adoption of SLM, and channel funds from sectoral programs to SLM. The extensionists associated with the production authorities will provide training on SLM in some of the project's Specific Intervention Areas (SEIs), with project support. Under the project, provincial production authorities will benefit from training on the use of the LADA methodology to evaluate LD and on SLM and INRM in general. It should be noted that in some provinces the environment and agricultural authorities are one and the same. They will play important part in channeling funding of baseline.
Provincial units responsible for Spatial Data Infrastructure	These units will be strengthened with the development of provincial SLM nodes that will be linked to national nodes. For those provinces without such units, the project will work with the relevant environment authorities to strengthen information management and linkages for effective decision-making.
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAGyP)	As one of the key baseline programs and the provider of cofinancing at the provincial level, MAGyP will for part of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). It will also be one of the targets of

STAKEHOLDER	RELEVANT ROLES
	institutional strengthening and mainstreaming activities under Outcome 2. MAGyP will participate in project activities, such as the economic valuation of SLM benefits and costs, and the development of a proposal to integrate SLM criteria in credit mechanisms. MAGyP includes the Unit for Rural Change, which houses all of MAGyP's externally-funded projects and programs, such as PROSAP and PRODERI (see separate entry on sectoral programs).
INTA	INTA is an institute associated with the MAGyP charged with agricultural extension, among other responsibilities. It will be a member of the multisectoral committees to be developed under this project. It will provide extension services on SLM for some of the SEIs, with project support for the extensionists' travel and other expenses. INTA will also contribute to the valuation of SLM benefits and costs.
National Observatory on Land Degradation and Desertification (ONDyT)	The National Observatory on Land Degradation and Desertification, chaired by the SAYDS, gathers information on land degradation levels, tendencies and risks so as to develop appropriate prevention, control and mitigation measures and to guide decision-making. Its members include CONICET, among others. The ONDyT will contribute its expertise to the ranking of LD hotspots, development of SLM guides and protocols, valuation of SLM costs and net benefits, and will benefit from training related to the establishment of the GIS system for LD/ SLM monitoring. It will also be responsible for LD M&E, including for the project indicators, in order to evaluate project impact.
Community Based Organizations (See Annex ProDoc for specificities)	Key CSOs include: NGOs, Cooperatives and Farmers Associations. They will be involved in activities under Outcome 1 and 2 in terms of the promotion of SLM practices and the multi-sectoral committees. They will also be important for facilitating replication of SLM practices in a wide array of differing landscapes through their broad membership and networks.
Sectoral Programs (e.g., PROSAP, Family Agriculture Program, PRODERI, Goat Law, Native Forest Act)	This includes national sectoral programs, which are implemented at the provincial level, as well as programs under the provincial agricultural production and environmental authorities. The project will work closely with these to promote the integration of SLM criteria in their operational manuals to influence sectoral investments. In addition, these programs will serve as a conduit for the replication of SLM practices. They will also provide co-financing to the project.
Ministry of Social Development (MDS) and its decentralized agencies	The project will work together with its decentralized agencies, including the National Commission on Microcredit (CONAMI), the National Institute of Association and Social Economy (INAES), and the National Institute of Indigenous Affairs (INAI), among others. These will provide assistance for the implementation of the project.
Local communities (men and women)	As the ultimate beneficiaries of this project, the local communities of dryland rural areas of eight provinces will be involved in the confirmation of SEIs and implementation of field-level project activities. They will benefit from training on SLM practices as well as training to facilitate access to credit and other financial instruments. They will have an important role to play in promoting replication of SLM practices to the ecoregional levels. They will also participate in the multisectoral committees. The project will define appropriate strategies to ensure that both women and men participate in training and capacity building activities and that the activities respond to both gender's needs.

## **B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of GEBS:**

8. The project will deliver substantial development benefits to the local populations of the three target ecoregions. Increased capacities and know-how to implement SLM will enable producers to combat land degradation and desertification and will lead to increased productivity and reduced emigration from rural areas. The increased capacity and strengthened enabling framework will also enable decision makers to increasingly promote SLM in policies, program and projects. During the project, direct benefits will be provided to an estimated 5,000 rural farmers within AGIs. In addition by institutionalising SLM and mainstreaming it into baseline production programmes for longer term replication at least 50% of farming households in all the drylands provinces will incur indirect benefits over the medium and long term. By increasing and strengthening crop, rangeland and livestock management, productivity is expected to increase and with this, income. Further benefits will be incurred by providing more stable incomes and by reducing economic vulnerability through diversification and sustainable production. Reducing land degradation processes also will deliver benefits and reduce vulnerability to climatic changes, which can lead to increased extreme events that can trigger natural disasters on degraded land. By building multi-stakeholder and sector platforms and developing management plans for communities, local actors will be empowered. The active participation of women, youth and indigenous people in training and capacity building activities will contribute to greater empowerment, increased



livelihoods and income for vulnerable populations. The project will adopt appropriate approaches to convene and work with indigenous populations to ensure that they participate and benefit fully from the project, including by building on existing practices with strong local acceptance. In addition, the project will define monitoring methodologies in order to enable differentiated tracking of project impacts on men and women.

### **B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

9. The project strategy is highly cost effective due to the synergies to be created with large baseline sectoral programs. The project will promote the integration of SLM protocols and criteria into the operational manuals of at least two such programs (Output 2.3). Since these manuals are utilized to guide investments, the project will be able to influence large baseline and future spending. Through coordination with existing sectoral programs, the project will also benefit from significant co-funding.

10. It should also be noted that the project will build on multiple previous experiences in the country in the promotion of SLM and reduction of LD and desertification. The consideration of lessons learned and use of previously developed tools and information increases the cost-efficiency of the project as it does not need to start from scratch. Specifically, important baseline information has been generated by LADA in terms national-level land degradation maps, which will serve as an input in the validation of LD hotspots in the three target ecoregions. In addition, the LADA project identified SLM best practices, which can now be implemented with this project in the SEIs. INTA and IADIZA have also carried out extension work and research on appropriate SLM practices in drylands to reduce LD and promote sustainable livelihoods. Coordination and synergies will be achieved between the drylands project and the "Increasing Climate Resilience and Improving Sustainable Land Management in the Southwest of the Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina" project, whose period of implementation coincides with this project. Both projects are focused on SLM, adopt the same approach using SEIs and AGIs, and share the same executing agency.

11. The project's approach of working with Specific Intervention Sites (SEIs), which represent different levels of land degradation and different relevant land uses will facilitate the upscaling of the SLM practices over larger areas of land. This includes the entire hierarchy of land degradation interventions (prevent; reduce; restore) and relevant practices will be replicated to ensure prevention in vulnerable areas thus reducing costs in long term by avoiding the need for costly restoration actions in the future. The development of SLM protocols for each of the main land uses and protocols for each of the eight provinces will also facilitate the replication and upscaling of project activities. The protocols will be an important input into the Provincial Action Programs to be developed with project assistance, which will guide SLM actions over the longer term. Finally, the project's investment in training of key actors supports cost effectiveness by facilitating future promotion of SLM with target groups. Project support for strengthening inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms will serve to reduce duplication among different sectors and promote increased cooperation with the objective of reducing LD.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

12. Project M&E will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP-CO with support from the UNDP/GEF RSC in Panama City. The Project Strategic Results Framework provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes an inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits. The following sections outline the principle components of the M&E plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in the table below. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized in the Project Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

#### ***Project Inception Phase***

13. A Project Inception Workshop (IW) will be held within the first three (3) months of project start-up with the full project team, relevant GoA counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO, and representation from the UNDP-GEF RSC, as well as UNDP-GEF headquarters as appropriate. A fundamental objective of this IW will be to help the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objectives, as well as finalize preparation of the project's

first annual work plan on the basis of the Project Results Framework and the LD GEF Tracking Tool. This will include reviewing the results framework (indicators, means of verification, and assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the Annual Workplan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

14. Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: a) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible RSC staff; b) detail the roles, support services, and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RSC staff in relation to the project team; c) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and M&E requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR/PIR), as well as Mid-term Review and Final evaluation. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews including arrangements for annual audit, and mandatory budget re-phrasings.

15. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed, as needed, in order to clarify each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. The IW will also be used to plan and schedule the Tripartite Committee Reviews. A report on the Inception Workshop is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting (see details below).

### ***Monitoring Responsibilities and Events***

16. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: a) tentative timeframes for Tripartite Committee (TPC) Reviews, Steering Committee (or relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms); and b) project-related M&E activities.

17. **Day-to-day monitoring** of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Technical Coordinator (PTC) based on the project's AWP and its indicators. The PTC will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The PTC will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the IW with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF RSC. Specific targets for the first-year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years will be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team. Measurement of impact indicators related to global benefits will occur according to the schedules defined through specific studies that are to form part of the project's activities.

18. **Changes in local Exchange Rates and anticipation of changes in exchange rates.** Possible changes in local exchange rates due to the differences in the rates will be increased or decreased in the corresponding value of U.S. dollars (USD) for each deposit, in accordance with Chapter 5, rule 5.04 of the UNDP Financing Manual. The adjustment will be made through budgetary revision, previously anticipated to the steering committee members.

19. On a quarterly basis, the UNDP, jointly with the Project Director, will perform an analysis of the how much the available budget can cover and of the available project funds (as a result of eventual variations in exchange rates) in order to adjust the work plans. Any modifications needed will be made through a project revision, in accordance with SC members

20. **Periodic monitoring** of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP CO through quarterly meetings with the project implementation team, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock of and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure the timely implementation of project activities. The UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RSC, as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to the project's field sites, or more often based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report and AWP to

assess first-hand project progress. Any other member of the Steering Committee can also take part in these trips, as decided by the Steering Committee. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the UNDP CO and ciRSClated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all Steering Committee members, and UNDP-GEF.

21. **Annual monitoring** will occur through the Steering Committee meetings. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to Steering Committee review at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held after the inception workshop. The project proponent will prepare an APR/PIR and submit it to UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF regional office at least two weeks prior to the Steering Committee meeting for review and comments.

22. The APR/PIR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TPC. The PTC will present the APR/PIR to the Steering Committee, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the Steering Committee participants. The PTC will also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR/PIR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The Steering Committee has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the IW, based on delivery rates and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

23. The **Terminal Steering Committee Review** is held in the last month of project operations. The PTC is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and to UNDP-GEF RSC. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the Steering Committee meeting in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the Steering Committee meeting. The terminal Steering Committee review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learned can be captured to feed into other projects being implemented.

### ***Project Monitoring Reporting***

24. The PTC, in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team, will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process and that are mandatory.

25. A **Project Inception Report (IR)** will be prepared immediately following the IW. It will include a detailed First Year/AWP divided in quarterly timeframes detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This work plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP CO or the RSC or consultants, as well as timeframes for meetings of the project's decision-making structures. The IR will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the AWP, and including any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12-month timeframe. The IR will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions, and feedback mechanisms of project-related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalized, the IR will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to the IR's circulation, the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF's RSC will review the document.

26. In light of the similarities of both APR/PIR and PIR, UNDP-GEF has prepared a harmonized format for use in fulfilling the following two requirements:

27. The **Annual Project Report (APR/PIR)** is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP CO central oversight, monitoring, and project management. It is a self-assessment report by the project management to the CO and provides input to the country office reporting process and the Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), as well as forming a key input to the PB Review. An APR/PIR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the PB Review, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's AWP and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The format of the APR/PIR is flexible but should include the following sections:

a) project risks, issues, and adaptive management; b) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets, c) outcome performance; and d) lessons learned/best practices.

28. The **Project Implementation Review (PIR)** is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from on-going projects. Once the project has been under implementation for one year, a PIR must be completed by the CO together with the project management. The PIR can be prepared any time during the year and ideally prior to the TPC review. The PIR should then be discussed in the Project Steering Committee meeting so that the result would be a PIR that has been agreed upon by the project, the Implementing Partner, UNDP CO, and the RSC in Panama. The individual PIRs are collected, reviewed, and analyzed by the RSC prior to sending them to the focal area clusters at the UNDP-GEF headquarters.

29. Quarterly Progress Reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RSC by the project team. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform and the risk log should be regularly updated in ATLAS based on the initial risk analysis.

30. **Specific Thematic Reports** focusing on specific issues or areas of activity will be prepared by the project team when requested by UNDP, UNDP-GEF, or the Implementing Partner. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learned exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

31. A **Project Terminal Report** will be prepared by the project team during the last three (3) months of the project. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project; lessons learned; objectives met or not achieved; structures and systems implemented, etc.; and will be the definitive statement of the project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's activities.

32. **Technical Reports** are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary, this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APR/PIRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive and specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national, and international levels.

33. Project Publications will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the project in the form of journal articles or multimedia publications. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance and scientific worth of these reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and (in consultation with UNDP, the GoA, and other relevant stakeholder groups) will also plan and produce these publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

### ***Independent Evaluations***

34. The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:

35. An independent **Mid-Term Review** will be undertaken at the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues

requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, ToRs, and exact timing of the Mid-Term Review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToRs for this Mid-Term Review will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RSC. The management response of the evaluation will be uploaded to the UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the mid-term review cycle.

36. An independent **Final Evaluation** will take place three months prior to the terminal Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-Term Review. The Final Evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The ToRs for this evaluation will be prepared through close collaboration between the PEU, SAyDS and the UNDP-CO, based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RSC. All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the final evaluation.

### ***Audit Clause***

37. The GoA will provide the Resident Representative with certified periodic financial statements, and with an annual audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNDP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures set out in the Programming and Finance rules and regulations. The audit will be conducted according to UNDP's financial regulations, rules, and audit policies by the legally recognized auditor by the GoA, or by a commercial auditor engaged by the GoA.

### ***Learning and Knowledge Sharing***

38. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP-GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. UNDP-GEF RSC has established an electronic platform for sharing lessons between the project managers. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identifying and analyzing lessons learned is an ongoing process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every twelve (12) months. UNDP-GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting, and reporting on lessons learned. Specifically, the project will ensure coordination in terms of avoiding overlap, sharing best practices, and generating knowledge products of best practices in the area of sustainable land management.

### ***M&E work plan and budget***

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$	Time frame
Inception Workshop	National Project Coordinator (NPC) Technical Project Coordinator (TPC) UNDP	\$14,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	TPC	0	Immediately after workshop
Field-based impact monitoring including oversight visits to sites	TPC Ecoregional Consultant (EC)	\$21,000	Ongoing
Quarterly reports on project progress	TPC	0	Quarterly
APR/PIR/ with LD Tracking Tools	Project Technical Coordinator- UNDP CO- UNDP- GEF	0	Annual
Steering Committee Meetings	NPC TPC	0	One time per year
Advisory Committee	NPC TPC	\$31,000	Three times per year

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$	Time frame
Tripartite Committee Meetings	GEF Focal Point, UNDP CO, Project team	0	Yearly
Technical Reports	TPC EC	0	As necessary
Financial audits	UNDP CO	\$14,060	Yearly \$2,812
Mid-term Review	Project team UNDP CO UNDP RSC Evaluation team	\$25,000	At the mid-point or third year of project implementation.
Lessons Learned and printing	TPC	\$ 24,989	At least two months before end of project
Final Evaluation	Project team, UNDP CO UNDP RSC Evaluation team	\$25,000	At project closure
Project Terminal Report	PTC	0	At least one month before the end of the project
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		\$155,049	


### PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY

#### **A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:**

(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Graciela Conesa	GEF, Operational Focal Point	SAyDS	July 16, 2012

#### **B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i		22 May 2014	Helen Negret, EBD Senior Technical Advisor	+(507) - 3024508	helen.negret@undp.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:</b>
Outcome 2: Policies and strategies designed and implemented for the management and conservation of land, forests, water resources and biological diversity.
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b>
Number of provinces with high forest cover that apply territorial norms for the conservation of natural resources.
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</b>
Manage energy and environment for sustainable development
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b>
LD 1: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustaining the livelihoods of local communities
LD 3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b>
Outcome 1.2: Improved rangelands /livestock management.
Outcome 1.3 Sustained flow of services in agro-ecosystems
Outcome 3.1: Cross- sectoral enabling environment for integrated landscape management (in support of SLM)
Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management adopted by local communities.
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b>
Indicator 1.2 Increased land area with sustained productivity and reduced vulnerability of communities to climate variability
Indicator 1.3 Maintained/increased flow of services in agro-ecosystems
Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses
Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target By Project End	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: A framework for Sustainable Land Management implemented to mitigate land degradation, maintain ecosystem services and improve the quality of life of the rural populations of the drylands of Northwest Argentina	Area (in ha) in which SLM measures are being applied in the three target dryland ecoregions in NOA and Cuyo.	Area covered with some form of SLM is 744,232 ha in the three target dryland ecoregions in NOA and Cuyo	SLM measures are applied in 1,480,000 ha to avoid and reduce LD in the 3 dryland ecoregions of NOA and Cuyo: Puna: 450,000 ha Dry Valleys Scrub: 750,000 ha Plains and Plateaus Scrub: 280,000 ha).	PEU- Reports of the provincial focal points with information from INTA/ IPAF- Family Agriculture/ PROSAP-CNA	The national and provincial governments maintain their support for project implementation.
	% of area with bare ground in 3 provinces	Bare ground surface area is 3,188,905 ha in the 3 provinces in the project	5% reduction in the area with bare ground in at least 3 provinces	National Observatory of Land Degradation and Desertification Data	Producers are open to the implementation of SLM and to participation in associated training courses.
	% of producers associated with agriculture/ livestock organisations that support SLM (NGOS; Cooperatives etc) Ranking Values: 5: 100% to 76 %	Catamarca: 2 Mendoza: 1 Jujuy: 2 La Rioja: 2 Salta: 2 San Juan: 1 San Luis: 1	Value increases at least one category in each Province  (more specific targets per ecoregion/area of intervention will be defined once interviews are completed in the first semester)	Project interviews with producers in first 6 months of project and at end of the project.	The commitment of the key stakeholders from public and private institutions is maintained.  Climatic variations

	4: 75% to 51% 3: 50% to 26% 2: 25% to 10 % 1: less than 10%	Tucuman: 2 Baseline values currently defined on data at provincial level			remain within projected scenarios.
	Increase in equitable access to water as measured by % of small farms that access surface water for irrigation (with or without pumping) Ranking Values: 5: 100% to 76 % 4: 75% to 51% 3: 50% to 26% 2: 25% to 10 % 1: Less than 10%	Catamarca: 4 Mendoza: 5 Jujuy: 4 La Rioja: 4 Salta: 4 San Juan: 4 San Luis: 2 Tucuman: 3 Baseline values are data at provincial level and are skewed upwards due to high % of large farms with access to water	Disaggregated values will be determined through interviews in year 1 to define % small farmer with access to water and specific targets for each intervention area (AGI)	Project interviews with producers in first 3 months of project and at end of the project.	The socioeconomic conditions of the population in the project area remain stable.
	% of population with Unmet Basic needs compared to the national average (NatAv) Ranking values 5: Below NatAv 4: 0 to 25 % above NatAv 3: 26 - 50 % above NatAv 2: 51 - 75 % above NatAv: 1: 76 -100% above NatAv	Catamarca: 1 Mendoza: 4 Jujuy: 1 La Rioja: 1 Salta: 1 San Juan: 1 San Luis: 3 Tucuman: 1	6 of the 8 provinces increase at least one rank	Project interviews with local inhabitants in first 3 months of project and at end of the project.	
Outcome 1: SLM practices implemented to avoid and reduce soil degradation in the environmental hotspots of the three target arid ecoregions covering 14,800 km².	Number of families implementing any of the SLM practices.	1440 families	5000 families implementing at least one SLM practice by the end of the project (3560 additional families), representing a 347% increase.	PEU- reports of the provincial Focal Points based on information from INTA- IPAF- Family Agriculture- PROSAP.CNA	Climatic variations remain within projected scenarios.
	Level of cross-sectoral coordination capacity for promotion of SLM and INRM as measured by Question 3.1 on the LD Tracking Tool (Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management-capacity strengthening).	One point scored in GEF LD Tracking Tool Question 3.1	At least 3 points are obtained in the GEF LD tracking tool Question 3.1	Minutes of the Multi-sectoral Committees in 3 ecoregions	Producers are open to the implementation of SLM and to participation in training courses on the topic.
	Funding in US \$ allocated	There are not any funds	Revolving funds, small credit	Reports of the	Changes in political authorities do not alter the level of commitment to the adoption of SLM and the avoidance of LD.
					The existing funding



	through revolving funds, microcredit programs and/or other financial mechanisms to facilitate SLM and INRM.	specifically earmarked for this purpose at the moment.	schemes and/or other financial instruments allocate \$ 10 million to productive sectors or activities that incorporate SLM or INRM by the end of the project. (amount to be confirmed in the first semester of the project)	Provincial Focal Points, the PEU and the Multi-sectoral Committees.  Reports from CONAMI on distribution of RF and MC	support from programs is maintained despite changes in political authorities.
<p><u>Outputs:</u></p> <p>Output 1.1: Guides/ protocols developed to support planning and implementation of SLM at the local level in the selected ecoregions and land degradation hotspots.</p> <p>Output 1.2 Multisectoral committees promote dialogue on SLM and coordination of sectoral programs at the level of AGIs and guide the implementation of SLM guides/ protocols.</p> <p>Output 1.3: SLM practices are implemented in dryland ecoregions in critical LD hotspots.</p> <p>Output 1.4. The allocation of financial resources for small farmers supports the continued implementation of SLM in priority areas.</p>					
Outcome 2: Enabling framework to plan, monitor and adapt land management at the ecoregional level developed.	Level of replication of SLM practices in drylands of the three target ecoregions of the project	0	At least 20% of farm households in hotspots and high risk areas of 75% NW dryland provinces replicate best SLM and IEM practices	Surveys at project end, application of SLM monitoring protocols See Annex 9 for more details	There is a willingness on behalf of the technicians and the GoPs to provide training on SLM/INRM and to incorporate SLM/ INRM criteria in their actions.  The commitments made by the GoPs are maintained throughout the duration of the project and despite changes in political administrations.
	Area monitored, with respect to the implementation of SLM through provincial GIS systems that are integrated with the national node.	Observatory currently monitors 865,516 ha in NOA and Cuyo	1,480,000 ha (Puna: 450,00 ha, Dry Valleys scrub: 750,000 ha, and Plains and Plateaus scrub: 280,000 ha) of the ecoregions of the drylands of NOA and Cuyo are monitored with respect to the implementation of SLM, with the results being stored in provincial GIS systems that are integrated with the national node.	Graphical outputs (reports) from the GIS systems of the GoPs (environment/ statistics or IDE) and from the ONDTyD	
	Percentage of staff in the environmental, production (agriculture and livestock management) and water management sectors working directly or indirectly on LD issues that have been trained on SLM at the provincial level	Specific training on SLM is only provided in the provinces of Catamarca and San Luis and the staff is not applying any SLM/INRM guides or protocols as these are not available	100% of staff involved in LD issues trained on SLM in the three sectors of environment, agriculture and hydrological management and all employ the SLM guides and protocols to assist in the development, implementation and evaluation of sectoral plans, programs and activities in the drylands of NOA and Cuyo.	Reports of the Provincial Focal Points.  Reports from the National Observatory of Land Degradation and Desertification	
	Number of Provincial Action Programs developed and beginning to be	There is one PAP developed for La Rioja.	At least three additional provinces have developed PAPs and are beginning to implement them by	Published Provincial Action Programs.	

	implemented.		the end of the project (Catamarca, Mendoza and Jujuy).	Reports of Multisectoral Committees on activities related to PAP implementation. Reports of Project Execution Unit.	
	Number of baseline programs that integrate SLM and INRM criteria and apply them in the field.	Sector investment baselines programmes have some partial mention of SLM and INRM.	At least two baseline programs <sup>1</sup> formally incorporate SLM and INRM criteria in their operational manuals	Reports of the provincial focal points. Operational manuals of the sectoral programs	
<u>Outputs:</u> Output 2.1: Geographic Information Systems (GIS) for the monitoring and evaluation of LD/SLM in the drylands of the 8 provinces. Output 2.2: Provincial government institutions apply SLM practices Output 2.3: National sectoral programs in drylands incorporate SLM practices					

<sup>11</sup> See baseline program section for sectoral programs with which the project could work.

## ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference
<b>GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion, January 09, 2012.</b>		
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>The project's consistency with NAP has been described in greater detail. The project will provide tools, information and processes that are critical for the implementation of five of the six strategic lines of the NAP: i) ) addressing the causes of land degradation; ii) building regional capacity for SLM; iii) building institutional and financial frameworks; iv) upscaling SLM best practices across multiple use landscapes; and (v) creating awareness on desertification in a wide variety of stakeholders. Furthermore the project addresses a region that played a central role in the development of the NAP and has been identified as a priority for intervention in a number of programmes and strategies.</p> <p>The project is also consistent with the UNCCD 10-year Strategic Plan and Framework, including its Objectives related to advocacy, awareness raising and education; policy framework; science, technology and knowledge; capacity building; and financing and technology transfer .</p>	Please see Country Ownership: Eligibility and Motivation, paragraph 198. Also see consistency with GEF Focal Area Strategies, paragraph 195.
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.	As explained in the ProDoc, institutional sustainability will be achieved through several elements, most notably, capacity building and establishment of coordination mechanisms. The project will carry out training activities at the provincial and national levels on SLM and INRM and the expected impacts of climate change, among other related topics. The extension work will be carried out by existing staff from the provincial agricultural authorities, INTA, and sectoral programs, who will be trained to incorporate SLM; this adds an element of sustainability as the capacity built will not be lost once the project closes. In addition, multi-sectoral committees will be established to guide the development of the SLM protocols, to support SLM implementation and to support the incorporation of SLM criteria in existing baseline sectoral programs. These multi-sectoral committees will permit more integrated planning among key institutions and agencies than the traditional unisectoral approach that has been employed. The committees will be formally established before project closure. The development of protocols and of Provincial Action Programs will also play a role in institutional sustainability as the roles and responsibilities of all the key stakeholders and the priority actions to reduce LD will be outlined therein.	Please see Institutional Sustainability section, paragraph 211.
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>The environmental and development benefits of the project have been described in greater detail. For example, the project is expected to lead to reduced soil erosion, positive impacts on crop productivity and reduced water deficiencies, as well as socio-economic benefits such as more stable incomes and increased incomes.</p> <p>The tracking tools have been prepared for arid and semi-arid agroecological zones. As per these tools, the project is expected to lead to improved agricultural management over 61,700 ha, improved rangeland and pasture management over 2,691,000 ha, and integrated landscape management over 1,291,650 ha. In addition, the target for vegetation cover is 4,044,350 ha and for improved irrigation flow-land area is 61,700 ha. Measurable targets for development benefits were also included in the tracking tool: For example, the target for productivity of crops of 2.63 tons/ ha and for livestock production it is 731,544 (this corresponds to a maintenance of the baseline productivity levels by project end at a minimum). Targets for all other indicators of environmental and socio-economic impacts were included in the Strategic Results Framework, such as percentage reduction in area with bare soil in the three provinces, % of population with Unmet Basic Needs and access by small farmers to water.</p>	<p>See paragraphs 187-193.</p> <p>See tracking tools for arid and semi-arid agroecological zones. See Part III of ProDoc with Strategic Results Framework.</p>
Role of specific stakeholders	A stakeholder analysis was carried out during the PPG phase by the social consultant hired to identify all	See Table 5:

including CSOs has been identified, and should be taken into consideration during project development.	the main actors associated with this project and what role they will play in project implementation, including Civil Society Organizations. A total of 19 CSOs were identified during project development, which could play roles in project execution in Specific Intervention Sites, replication activities and provision of advice. Examples include Bosques Modelo Jujuy, Nueva Gestión Fundación para el Desarrollo Social, Fundación Ecoandina and ADZOA (Asociación para el Desarrollo de Zonas Áridas). The Stakeholder Involvement Plan now includes this detail on the role of CSOs. The process of development of the ProDoc was a fully participatory exercise involving all the main key stakeholders.	Stakeholders and Roles in Project as well as Annex 5: Stakeholder Involvement Plan.
Yes, relevant risks have been identified, but need to be further elaborated during project development.	During the PPG phase, a more detailed risk analysis was undertaken and the information was included in the Project Risks section. Several additional possible risks were identified in response to the comments raised by the STAP screening, such as the risk of institutional rigidity and resistance to inter-institutional and multisectoral collaboration; and the risk of barriers to the reform of baseline programs. Mitigation measures have been identified including the development and institutionalization of multi-sectoral committees, which would include the key institutions and sectors as well as representatives of the main sectoral baseline programs.	See Table 10: Project Risks and Mitigation Measures, pages 56-58.
Several existing initiatives have been identified for coordination, but specific details on areas for coordination should be elaborated during project development.	Areas for coordination have been detailed in the ProDoc for all the initiatives described in the PIF, as well as for additional initiatives of relevance identified since, including the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Program and the "Increasing Climate Resilience and Improving Sustainable Land Management in the Southwest of the Province of Buenos Aires, Argentina" project (2014-2019). In addition, more details were provided on how the project will ensure coordination among relevant initiatives, such as through biannual workshops and sharing of annual workplans.	See Coordination with other GEF initiatives, paragraphs 203-209

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), date of screening: January 25, 2012		
In component 1, STAP suggests defining explicitly the methodology that will be used to assess the values of the different SLM practices and the ecosystem benefits they are likely to generate. STAP also encourages UNDP to provide scientific references supporting the valuation of land-based ecosystems services. Additionally, UNDP may wish to refer to the following two publications on valuing ecosystem services: 1) de Groot R., et al. "Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary units." Ecosystem Services 1 (2012), 50-61. 2) Farley, J. Ecosystem services: The economic debate". Ecosystem Services 1 (2012), 40-49.	As part of Output 1.4, the project will carry out a valuation of the costs/ benefits of different SLM practices and production systems, including consideration of economic, social and environmental issues. More details on the methodology that will be used have now been provided in the description of that Output. The costs and benefits of implementation of the different SLM practices applied to the main land use systems will be determined. This analysis will factor in social issues (including data on livelihoods as per the IFAD methodology) and environmental issues in conjunction with microeconomic evidence at the level of producers and the productive sector. It will determine possible private returns and how these can justify the required investments. Once the project's Specific Intervention Sites within the Geographic Areas of Intervention (AIGs) are confirmed defined, the priority ecosystem services associated with these SEIs will be determined for inclusion in the valuation exercise in order to help identify the environmental benefits associated with the SLM practices. The Project Execution Unit will take into consideration the references provided by STAP as well as the lessons learned from the previous GEF/ UNDP/UNEP ecosystem valuation project implemented in Argentina, i.e., "Establishment of Incentives for the Conservation of Globally Important Ecosystem Services" (2009-2013). Specifically, that project provided information on the effect of different land uses on ecosystem services and methodologies that may be of	See description of Output 1.4, paragraph 153 and paragraph 203 of Coordination with other GEF Initiatives

	relevance to the drylands project.	
One aspect UNDP will need to consider is defining clearly the socio-economic context of valuing an ecosystem service, given the complexity and diversity of stakeholders likely to be affected by the project. For example, placing a value on an ecosystem service may exclude the livelihood dependence of stakeholders on that service (e.g. provision of food), thus, undervaluing the ecosystem service. Refer to de Groot R., et al. "Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary units". Ecosystem Services 1 (2012), 50-61.	The socio-economic context will be taken into consideration in the analysis of the costs/benefits of each of the SLM practices to be promoted, in addition to the environmental benefits of the practices. The reference provided by STAP will be reviewed by the Project Execution Unit. While the valuation of the SLM practices will take into account priority ecosystem services, please note that the project is not carrying out a comprehensive valuation of ecosystem services per se.	See description of Output 1.4, paragraph 153.
The proposal defines the global environmental benefits it intends to generate in the three eco-regions. Nonetheless, there is a need to identify indicators for each benefit, and to describe how these indicators will be measured and monitored throughout project implementation. Currently, the monitoring of global benefits is only succinctly described in the proposal section B.5. Therefore, STAP suggests describing more explicitly the methods for measuring and monitoring impact, in ways amenable for tracking the expected global environmental outcomes. This will strengthen the scientific rationale for the incremental cost reasoning. Moreover, STAP requests the inclusion of project-tracking mechanisms in the final proposal. Given the complicated institutional architecture of the project, means for its monitoring are indispensable for evaluation purposes.	Indicators to measure the project's global environmental benefits have now been identified, such as vegetation cover, percentage of area with bare ground and improved irrigation flow-land area. Details have been provided on how the indicators to measure environmental benefits will be measured. An additional Annex was developed which describes the methodology that will be used to measure each indicator, the sampling frequency, and the significance of the indicator. For some of the indicators, particularly environmental ones (e.g., percentage of area with bare ground in the three provinces), the methodology to measure them will be defined by the National Observatory of Land Degradation and Desertification (ONDyT). National indicators for the measurement of LD and desertification are being developed by the Observatory in 2014 and the methodologies to measure these will be adopted by the project to ensure consistency. For other indicators, such as area under SLM and number of families implementing any SLM measure, information will be obtained from relevant institutions and programs, including INTA/IPAF, Family Agriculture and PROSAP. Project tracking mechanisms to measure progress toward the project's objectives are described in the Monitoring and Evaluation section and will adhere to established UNDP/GEF procedures. Progress on project indicators will be reported annually in the Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs). In addition, AOPs will be used to establish and monitor intermediate process indicators.	See Annex 9: Project Monitoring Plan. See Part VI: Monitoring and Evaluation for project tracking mechanisms.
The geographical boundaries of the three eco-regions targeted by the project are loosely defined. The use of geographical coordinates or more specific geographic references would help further clarify the localization of the targeted regions as well as some of the politico-jurisdictional complexities inherent in the project's implementation.	Maps and geographic coordinates of the northern, southern, western and eastern extremes of the three target ecoregions have been included in Annex 3.	See Annex 5.
In addition, while the proposal stresses that land management challenges are not homogeneous in the targeted drylands, the catalysts and impact of land degradation are described generically. Table 2, which	The scale used in Table 2 has now been defined at the end of the Table (4- Severe, 3- Moderate, 2- Light, 1- No degradation).  Further detail on the main land uses in each ecoregion have also been provided. A	See Table 2, page 14.  See paragraphs 33-37 and Table 2 that

<p>synthesizes the effects of particular issues in each targeted ecosystem, is not sufficiently explicit“ i.e. the meaning, scale, and weighting methodology for the values presented in Table 2 is unclear. A further description of this analysis would be helpful. Alternatively, references to LADA documents describing the land degradation analysis (drivers and impacts) could be provided in the proposal.</p>	<p>Table summarizing the main land uses and threats in each Geographic Intervention Area (AGI) has also now been included.</p> <p>The use of LADA documents and approaches has been emphasized throughout the text as appropriate.</p>	<p>follows.</p>
<p>STAP also welcomes a more detailed explanation of the land-use conflicts and ecological challenges that specifically affect each targeted eco-region, especially in terms of how they affect particular ongoing practices and stakeholders. The illustration of the specific activities driving environmental degradation will facilitate the linkage of regional issues to global challenges, re-emphasizing the potential global benefits to be derived from the project.</p>	<p>Greater detail on the ecological challenges/ threats to LD has been added, as well as more details on the practices that are driving LD. A Table has been added with the main land uses in each targeted ecoregion, along with the practices that are driving LD, such as overgrazing and poor management of pastures and rangelands, poor management of water (salinization), deforestation and alteration of the hydrological cycle, and the associated environmental impacts. The causes of land degradation are described in detail in the text, principally: increased stocking and overgrazing; expansion of the agricultural frontier, associated fires and poorly managed irrigation practices; natural phenomena and climate change; and logging and fuelwood gathering.</p> <p>The need to improve coordination among the agriculture, livestock management and water management sectors to address the threats was highlighted throughout the ProDoc in order to improve coordination and reduce the possibility of future land use conflicts.</p>	<p>See Table 2 on page 14 for more information on the threats See paragraphs 52-59 for causes of land degradation and Table 2 for impacts.</p>
<p>The Risk Assessment in Section B.4 appears limited. The assessment fails to mention, for example, risks concerning the magnitude of livelihood benefits over and above the costs associated with implementing best practices. Furthermore, the proposal does not address whether the introduction of SLM strategies is achievable throughout the targeted areas, nor potential resistances from political actors involved in baseline programs. Due to the atomized nature of the governance authority, ongoing legal challenges to the implementation of the baseline programs, and institutional asymmetries in Argentina, the institutional and political risks need to be addressed more explicitly. STAP recommends including the risk of: non-recovery; institutional rigidity and resistance to inter-institutional collaboration; and, barriers to the implementation and reform of baseline programs.</p>	<p>The Risks table has been updated, with additional risks incorporated, including the risk of institutional rigidity and resistance to inter-institutional and multisectoral collaboration; and the risk of barriers to the reform of baseline programs.</p> <p>Regarding the risk related to the magnitude of livelihood benefits compared to cost of implementing best practices, the pre-selection of practices to be implemented included an assessment of the cost of implementation to ensure economic feasibility (information on this risk included within the risk, "Local communities are not sufficiently encouraged by direct benefits and thus reluctant to adopt behavioral changes needed to achieve goals in the long-term"). In addition, Annex 4 provides information from other regions on the economic feasibility of some of the key SLM practices to be promoted with the project. The project will also carry out a detailed valuation of the costs and benefits of these practices to quantify the magnitude of the livelihood benefits versus costs more carefully.</p> <p>The issue of limited inter-institutional collaboration is an important restriction that has undermined a multi-sectoral approach to reducing LD in the past. It is precisely for this reason that the project will promote the establishment of multisectoral committees. Also it should be noted that communication between the environmental and agricultural authorities was carried out during the PPG through consultations, meetings and participation in workshops and there was an openness to working together.</p>	<p>See Table 10, pages 56-58: Project Risks and Mitigation Measures. See Table 7 in Output 1.3, page 42 for Pre-Selected SLM practices including adaptation strategies.</p>

	<p>In order to address risks related to the reform of baseline programs, the project will work closely with stakeholders from the baseline programs through multi-sectoral committees and workshops in order to revise the operational manuals in use that guide resource allocation of the baseline programs. The development of the PAPs will also facilitate the modification of baseline investments to incorporate SLM.</p> <p>Finally, in terms of the risk of non-recovery of ecosystems, for those ecosystems in which rehabilitation is unlikely or too costly, the project will promote strategies to adapt to LD.</p>	
<b>Responses to Comments from Council Members</b>		
<p>Germany: Since participatory implementation is one of the key factors for success of the project and based on previous experiences in Argentina, we would suggest to consider with much more emphasis the INTA (Instituto de Tecnología Agropecuaria), especially the National Coordination for Extension Services, with its country-wide network of regional centers, research and advisory stations as one of the main implementing stakeholders for the project. The INTA National Coordination for Extension Services should be involved also in project formulation and especially in the planning and realization of participatory work with the local population.</p>	<p>During the project formulation process, INTA was consulted through provincial meetings that were carried out to familiarize the main actors with the project, obtain their feedback into its design, and their input into the pre-selection of the Specific Intervention Sites (SEIs). INTA also participated in the logical framework workshop organized in October 2013.</p> <p>INTA will be a full and active participation in project implementation, specifically in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- receipt of training in SLM</li> <li>- extension work with local population to promote SLM, through the use of their extension agents, supported by GEF funding for operational expenses.</li> <li>- input into development of SLM guides and protocols</li> <li>- monitoring of impacts of SLM practices</li> <li>- participation through the National Observatory on Land Degradation and Desertification.</li> </ul>	<p>See Table 5, page 31 for stakeholders and roles in project, and Annex 7: Stakeholder Involvement Plan.</p>
<p>Germany: One of the biggest problems for the rural population in the northwest of Argentina is the access to water. This shall be reflected more specifically in the final project document in order to address the preconditions for sustainable land use.</p>	<p>The project will work with local populations to address water restrictions. Some of the relevant practices to be promoted in the ecoregions include: capture and storage of rainwater (reservoirs in Catamarca), training in water administration and use in accordance with the type of crops, their phenological stage and the hydrological conditions of the soil; and irrigation systems associated with more efficient water usage (e.g., pressurized: drip irrigation, micro-aspersion). Different databases will be integrated to include hydrological and agrometeorological information within a GIS system to help inform decision making.</p> <p>The Provincial Action Programs will also address the issue of water restrictions as they relate to the implementation of SLM.</p>	<p>See Output 1.3, Table 7, page, p.42 for Pre-selected SLM practices.</p>
<p>Germany: The German cooperation is present via an integrated expert at INTA (Iris Barth, iris.barth@cimonline.de). Much experience of German cooperation in Argentina exists in the field of combating desertification. We suggest therefore to capitalize on this experience through the German integrated expert during the process of finalization of the project proposal.</p>	<p>The PPG phase involved consultation with INTA to take advantage of their expertise (see comments above).</p> <p>The German expert at INTA is not specifically working in the LD area at the moment, but several other experts working in LD were consulted.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS****A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:**

There were no significant findings that affected the project design or concerns on project implementation identified during the PPG stage.

**B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$94,000			
<i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i>	<i><b>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</b></i>		
	<i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Spent To date</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Committed</b></i>
Baseline and technical analyses to further identify and cost the actions to be included in the FSP.	94,000	75,722	18,278
Analysis of national and local capacities and consultations for finalizing the FSP details and its implementation arrangements.			
Development of feasibility analysis, budget and key project design elements			