



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

GEF ID:	9583		
Country/Region:	Argentina		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) into Development Planning: Making Environmental Land Use Planning (ELUP) Operational in Argentina		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5791 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; BD-4 Program 10; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,987	Project Grant:	\$8,995,434
Co-financing:	\$41,750,000	Total Project Cost:	\$50,745,434
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Helen Negret

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	July 26, 2016 Fully aligned with the BD and LD objectives and programs.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	July 26, 2016 Consistent with NBSAP and law supporting implementation of the UNCCD.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	July 26, 2016	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Comprehensive presentation of drivers, and issues related to sustainability, scaling and innovation within the project investment strategy clearly stated and justified.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	July 26, 2016 Yes, particularly at the PIF stage.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	July 26, 2016 Yes. During project design phase please reflect on the scale and ambition of the project in terms of geographic coverage and intervention strategies and assess feasibility and adjust if necessary.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	July 26, 2016 Yes, with clear plans for further engagement and participation of women, IPs, and CSOs. The project design is predicated on socio-economic considerations in the ELUPs and the ES valuation in developing policy.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	July 26, 2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	July 26, 2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	July 26, 2016 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	July 26, 2016 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	July 26, 2016 NA.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	July 26, 2016 Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

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

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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