

Sustainable Transformation of Agriculture in Uruguay

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11918
Countries
Uruguay
Project Name
Sustainable Transformation of Agriculture in Uruguay
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
3/6/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Ulrich Apel
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Clarification requested / project title change:

1. Executing agency: There appears to be an inconsistency regarding the executing agency. In the Project Information section, both the Ministry of Environment (MA) and the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP) are listed as executing agencies. However, later in

the document, ANDE is identified as the executing agency, with MA and MGAP indicated only as members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

2. Project title: In a GEF-wide effort to come up with more concise project titles, it is requested to change the project title to: "**Sustainable Transformation of Agriculture in Uruguay**". Please inform the OFP accordingly and seek agreement by email.

05/26/2026: The title change is not reflected in the portal. Please change in the portal accordingly.

06/02/2026: Has been changed by IT.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. The comment has been duly addressed. The roles of MGAP and MA have been clarified as direct beneficiaries of the project, while the National Development Agency (ANDE) has been confirmed as the Executing Agency.

2. Resolved. The Ministry of Environment has confirmed, via email and following consultation with MGAP, its agreement with the proposed title change. Please find attached the email for reference.

05/27/2026:

2. The title was modified in the GEF Portal.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Not fully

Rio Markers. These have been tagged as LD2, CCA2, CCM2 and BD1. A more appropriate tagging based on the project scope would be as follows: LD2, CCA1, CCM1 and BD1 .

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency ResponseDuly noted: The Rio Markers have been adjusted in line with the recommendations provided: LD2, CCA1, CCM1, and BD1.

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request03/18/2026: Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Yes. However,

1) The average budget amount of the GEF funded part for the M&E component for projects up to USD 5 million is around 5%; however for this project it is relatively high with 6.21%. Please request the agency to revise down to 5%.

2) Under KM, please ensure that women and women's organizations are actively involved in the dissemination of lessons learned and best practices.

3) Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results and lessons learned on advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as the implementation of the Gender Action Plan, are regularly monitored and reported on in the MTR and TE.

4) In addition, we request the Agency to consider responding "Yes" to Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, as the project aims to develop gender-responsive policies and to assess land tenure and land management arrangements in a way that considers women's access to, use of, and control over land.

5) Please adjust font for better readability.

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Duly noted. The budget for Monitoring and Evaluation has been adjusted to 5% of the GEF funded (USD 41,050).

2. Well noted. The comment has been addressed component 3, activity 3.1.2.3. Also, the Gender Action Plan includes this clarification.

3. The comment has been addressed in "Annex M" through the inclusion of the following paragraph: The M&E system will integrate gender-responsive indicators that ensure systematic tracking of progress on gender equality and women's empowerment. Implementation of the Gender Action Plan will be monitored regularly. Gender-related results, challenges and lessons learned will be documented and reported in key evaluation milestones, including the Mid-Term Review (MTR) and Terminal Evaluation (TE).

4. Duly noted. "Yes" response has been provided to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, as the project aims to develop gender-responsive policies and assess land tenure and management arrangements, explicitly considering women's access to, use of, and control over land.

5. The font size has been adjusted to improve readability.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Not fully.

The following actions are requested:

1. Smallholder, Family and Traditional Farming Practices: The project seeks to promote sustainable agricultural practices, beginning with an assessment of the status of agriculture in the region and the development of a national strategy. However, the project narrative suggests a focus primarily on medium to large scale farmers. Please clarify what role smallholder farmers, family farmers and traditional farmers will play in the project, and give consideration to how traditional knowledge and traditional farming practices could be incorporated into the project's recommendations.

2. In the PIF and ProDoc, please clarify the role of traditional farming practices, traditional knowledge, smallholder farming and family farming within the project. In the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, ensure that all potentially affected groups are included, among them small farmers, family farmers and traditional farmers, as previously suggested at PIF stage, and allocate a dedicated budget line for their consultation. Finally, should any Indigenous Peoples be present in the project area, recognizing their right to self-identification, ensure they are meaningfully and appropriately involved in the project in accordance with Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles.

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. The comment has been duly addressed. To clarify the role of family farmers in the project, the rationale section has been revised to incorporate the definition of Family Farming in accordance with Resolution No. MGAP 1013/2016, as referenced in the National Family Farming Plan. Subsequently, paragraphs 17 to 19 have been strengthened to recognize the role of family farming (a concept that encompasses smallholders and traditional production systems) as a central actor in the transition towards sustainable agri-food systems in Uruguay. To further align the role of family farmers within the project, Activity 1.1.1.2 (Characterization of the State of Agriculture) has been revised to include the following description: ??The characterization process will deepen the identification of traditional knowledge and agricultural practices that contribute to sustainability and will provide inputs to guide the co-innovation approach proposed under Activity 2.1.1.1.

Under Component 1, Outcome 2, which focuses on strengthening governance for the sustainable transition of agriculture, the role of family farmers is clearly defined within governance mechanisms. At least three nationally representative family farming organizations will be incorporated into the multi-stakeholder dialogue platform (agricultural roundtable), ensuring their effective participation in decision-making processes.

Please find that under Component 2, the participation of family farmers is further clarified in the implementation of pilot interventions. Family farmers, alongside medium-scale producers, will actively engage in the assessment of sustainable practices, on-farm validation, and the scaling up of solutions at the territorial level across the targeted departments. In addition, family farmers will play a key role in co-innovation processes and knowledge co-creation, contributing their traditional knowledge and practical experience to the design, adaptation, and dissemination of sustainable practices.

2. In line with the rationale outlined above, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been updated to include key family farming organizations in Uruguay, such as COPROFAM-Uruguay, REDAE, and CNFR. The Plan highlights the contributions and active participation of family farmers, emphasizing their representation in governance spaces and their role in co-innovation, validation, and scaling of sustainable practices.

With respect to Indigenous Peoples, please note that the project interventions areas are concentrated in the departments of Colonia, Soriano, Río Negro, and Paysandú, no direct impacts on collectively occupied Indigenous territories, traditional governance systems, or differentiated cultural practices are anticipated. Nevertheless, the project will respect and consider any expressions of Indigenous identity that may emerge during stakeholder engagement and consultation processes. The "Stakeholder Engagement Plan" incorporates the following description regarding Indigenous populations: The original Indigenous population in Uruguay was largely assimilated into colonial society or severely decimated during the first half of the nineteenth century. Although no longer existing as a distinct ethnic group, the Charrúa legacy remains an integral component of Uruguay's cultural and genetic identity. According to the World Bank report *Indigenous Latin America in the Twenty-First Century*, a proportion of the population self-identifies as being of Indigenous ancestry. However, these groups do not maintain collective territorial ownership, communal land use systems, or livelihoods directly dependent on natural resources. Rather, they are integrated within the broader national population, living predominantly in urban areas and participating in conventional economic activities.

Despite the absence of collectively recognized Indigenous territories, recent decades have witnessed increased visibility of groups self-identifying as Indigenous descendants. This process has been influenced by growing public debate surrounding the historical Charrúa genocide, academic research documenting Indigenous ancestry within the population, and the incorporation of self-identification variables in national census instruments. These dynamics have progressively transformed both social perceptions of identity and the way the State addresses Indigenous heritage and inclusion.

Data from the 2011 National Census identified more than 250,000 people self-identifying as Afro-descendants and nearly 160,000 people self-identifying as descendants of Indigenous peoples, representing approximately 8 percent and 5 percent of the national population, respectively. The highest proportion of individuals reporting Indigenous ancestry was concentrated in the departments of Tacuarembó (8.1 percent), followed by Salto (6.4 percent), Treinta y Tres (5.5 percent), and Rivera (5.4 percent).

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

- e) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
- f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
- i) **Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
- k) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
- l) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/18/2026: Yes

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Not fully.

(i) Please respond to the question "Will the GEF Agency play an execution role in this project?", as this field is currently left blank.

(ii) Executing agency: There appears to be an inconsistency regarding the executing agency. In the Project Information section, both the Ministry of Environment (MA) and the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP) are listed as executing agencies. However, later in the document, ANDE is identified as the executing agency, with MA and MGAP indicated only as members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

06/02/2026: Addressed. FAO will not have an execution role in the project.

Cleared

Agency Response

- i) No, FAO is not playing an execution role on this project.

ii) The inconsistency regarding roles has been addressed. In this case, the Ministry of Environment, in its capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point, has designated the National Development Agency (ANDE) as the Executing Agency.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Clarification requested.

(i) Please provide the Ex-ACT tool sheet so that the GEF team can properly track the GHG calculations. The Excel file currently provided does not allow for adequate tracking of the projected GHG reductions.

(ii) The restoration target under CI 3 of 50,000 ha appears high in view of the small project investment and the absence of any investment mobilized through co-financing. Please consider moving those 50,000 ha towards CI 4.3 unless additional investment can be confirmed.

(iii) Explanation under the table is inconsistent and exceeds the word limit of 250 words max. Please make this consistent and concise.

06/02/2026: Addressed and corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

i) Resolved. The Excel file corresponding to the GHG calculation has been attached. The estimated volume of GHG emissions mitigated is -1,068,556 metric tons of CO₂e, calculated over a 30-year period, comprising 3 years of project implementation and 27 years of capitalization. The calculation was conducted using the Nationally Determined Contribution Expert Tool (NEXT), a land-based accounting system that estimates annual carbon stock changes per unit of land (hectares), expressed in tons of CO₂ equivalent per year (tCO₂-eq/yr), over a 30-year time series.

ii) Duly noted. Our apologies, it was a typing error. Core Indicator 3 has been corrected to 5,000 hectares.

iii) iii) The wording and consistency of the methodology for measuring indicators in Section B.2 ?Table on Core Indicators? have been improved, within a maximum of 250 words.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Not fully.

1. Under Innovation risk, please ensure that the ratings and justification provided under the three related categories are focused on innovative aspects specific to the project. For example, the Financial and Business Model could address the risk of farmers and agribusinesses adopting new supply chain models. The Technological category could clarify what the "validated technology packages" are and related rating.
2. Under stakeholders, please consider elaborating further on mitigation measures, such as who will be engaged (industry associations?) and how.

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Duly noted. The risks have been reviewed under the innovation framework, restructuring the risk categories and clarifying the risk descriptions in line with their respective ratings (low/moderate). Mitigation measures have also been refined to ensure consistency and alignment with the identified risks.

i) Institutional and Policy (Low risk) The project is implemented within a well-established institutional and policy framework that strongly supports sustainable agricultural transformation. Key institutions, including MGAP, MA, INIA, and other relevant stakeholders, are actively engaged and aligned with the project's objectives, ensuring a high level of ownership and coordination. While minor risks may arise from coordination challenges across institutions or policy adjustments over time, these are considered limited. The project builds existing strategies, regulatory frameworks, and inter-institutional mechanisms, which significantly reduce uncertainty. Mitigation measures include strengthening coordination platforms, ensuring continuous policy dialogue, and embedding project interventions within national strategies and institutional mandates. Overall, the enabling environment and strong institutional commitment result in a low level of risk.

ii) Technological (moderate risk) The project entails technological and production-level risks associated with the implementation of digital tools and the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices. On the technological side, risks relate to potential system failures, limited interoperability, gaps in digital capacities, and low rural connectivity, which may affect the effective use of information systems for agro-environmental monitoring and decision-making. These risks will be mitigated through targeted digital capacity development, ensuring interoperability with national systems, the use of secure platforms aligned with data protection policies, and the establishment of backup, maintenance, and technical support mechanisms. Additionally, tools will be designed with low technological requirements to ensure accessibility, particularly for family farmers. At the production level, risks are associated with the adoption of sustainable practices, including cost barriers, uncertain cost-benefit perceptions among producers, and potential resistance to change. Mitigation measures will focus on promoting participatory innovation processes with producers and their organizations, demonstrating the economic viability of practices through validation and cost-benefit analysis, and providing incentives such as green financing, fiscal benefits, and enabling mechanisms (e.g. land-use planning and leasing arrangements). The project will also prioritize the identification and scaling of cost-effective practices to facilitate adoption.

iii) Financial and Business Model (moderate risk) The transition towards sustainable agriculture represents a structural shift in key economic variables, including technology costs, access to financing, land-use time horizons, and market responses. These factors, driven by profitability considerations, may affect the adoption of sustainable practices by producers. A related challenge is the limited market recognition and valuation of sustainability in commodity markets, particularly for cereals and oilseeds.

To mitigate these risks, the project will engage producers through a living laboratory approach, fostering participatory innovation processes and generating robust evidence on the cost-effectiveness of sustainable practices. This will support informed decision-making and strengthen the positioning of sustainability and environmental responsibility within the sector. In addition, the project will address market-related constraints by engaging intermediaries involved in processing and export value chains, promoting the development of corporate environmental responsibility and reputational incentives that can help compensate for the current lack of market-based rewards for sustainable production.

2. Stakeholder Engagement (Moderate risk) The project has been designed through a participatory process involving a broad range of stakeholders. While there is a strong core of committed institutions, including MGAP, MA, INIA, universities, family farmer organizations, cooperatives, and civil society, there remains a gap in engaging large private sector actors, particularly exporters and agro-industrial companies.

To mitigate the risk of limited participation and strengthen engagement, the project will implement a combined strategy focused on capacity development, effective communication, and improved access to information. In addition, it will promote international exchange with companies and business associations that have advanced in sustainable production models, fostering knowledge transfer, building incentives, and enhancing the alignment of private sector actors with sustainability objectives.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Yes. However, please address (refer also to comments above):

1) Under KM, please ensure that women and women's organizations are actively involved in the dissemination of lessons learned and best practices.

2) Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results and lessons learned on advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as the implementation of the Gender Action Plan, are regularly monitored and reported on in the MTR and TE.

3) In addition, we request the Agency to consider responding 'Yes' to Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, as the project aims to develop gender-responsive policies and to assess land tenure and land management arrangements in a way that considers women's access to, use of, and control over land.

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Well noted. The description of Activity 3.1.2.3 has been expanded. The project will ensure the active participation of women and their organizations in knowledge management processes, ensuring that communication products and strategies are gender-responsive. Measures will be implemented to strengthen their capacities and visibility as agents of change, and differentiated feedback mechanisms will be incorporated to enhance the relevance and reach of information. This has also been reinforced in the complementary activity under the Gender Action Plan.

2. Please find that Section M.1 in Annex M has been strengthened. The monitoring and evaluation system will incorporate gender-responsive indicators. The implementation of the Gender Action Plan will be periodically monitored, and results, challenges, and lessons learned will be systematically documented and reported in key evaluations, including the Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation. This has also been reinforced through a new section in the Gender Action Plan titled 'Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)'.

3. Addressed. 'Yes' has been added to reflect the project's contribution to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Yes. However, please address:

The PIF should better describe the roles of the different stakeholder related to project objectives and components, including the role of civil society, local communities, farmers, local producers, and community-based organizations. It should also provide further details on consultations with project stakeholder in project development and incorporate in the risk table on stakeholders any risks identified associated to stakeholder engagement. In addition, the annexed SEP should provide

further details on stakeholder engagement approaches, roles of stakeholder related to project components and activities.

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency ResponseDuly noted. In the project rationale section, a subsection is added describing the details of the consultation process with stakeholders, including public sector institutions, civil society, local communities, farmers, local producers, and community-based organizations. Also, the AnnexJ describe the stakeholder typology, consultation approaches, and considerations related to Indigenous populations in Uruguay. The document also summarizes the purpose and objectives of stakeholder engagement, stakeholder engagement considerations for the implementation phase, timetable, resources and responsibilities, monitoring and reporting arrangements, as well as aspects related to the Grievance Redress Mechanism.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request03/18/2026: Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Not fully.

1.) No co-financing letter has been submitted for MGAP. Please include with the resubmission.

2.) Please make an effort to mobilize investment through co-financing during PPG stage.

06/02/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Fully addressed. A co-financing letter has been submitted by MGAP for an amount of USD 2,700,000 in kind. Additionally, FAO will provide USD 352,658 in in-kind co-financing.

2. Noted. Commitments for in-kind co-financing have been secured from six institutions through contributions covering recurrent operational costs, totaling USD 6,903,185. In addition, the Government of Uruguay has committed to supporting the project with new investments during the implementation phase.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
03/18/2026:

The OFP listed on the GEF website is Mr. Edgardo Ortuno. The LoE is signed by a different person. Please clarify or correct.

06/02/2026: Has been clarified as per agency response below.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThe Project Identification Form (PIF) was endorsed by Mr. Robert Bouvier, former Minister of Environment of Uruguay (Government period 2020-2025), who served as the GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of endorsement. Following the constitutional transition of government in March 2025, Mr. Edgardo Ortuno assumed the position of Minister of Environment and currently serves as Uruguay's GEF Operational Focal Point. The difference in signatories reflects this change in government and institutional roles.
b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified

sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: Comments on the budget.

1. The submitted version does not comply with the GEF Budget Template found on page 58 of the [Guidelines on the Project Cycle](#). Please use the recommended budget template.

	Component 1		Component 2		Component 3					
Cost Categories	1.1	Total	2.1	Total	3.1	Total	M&E	PMC	Responsible Entity	Total GEF
5013 Consultants										
Project Coordinator	26,863	26,863	26,863	26,863	26,863	26,863		26,862.50	National Development Agency (ANDE)	107,450
Administrative Assistant		0		0		0		36,000.00	National Development Agency (ANDE)	36,000
Development communication specialist		0		0	72,000	72,000			National Development Agency (ANDE)	72,000
Expert in evaluation, dialogue, and public policy formulation (policy maker)	20,000	20,000							National Development Agency (ANDE)	20,000

2. Personnel costs account for 36% of the project budget, which is above the 30% threshold, please reduce them and clearly indicate where the funds have been allocated on the budget table.

3. The total amount for the Project Coordinator is not equal to the total amount of the different components + PMC as indicated in the budget table. Please amend.

5013 Consultants										
Project Coordinator	26,863	26,863	26,863	26,863	26,863	26,863		26,862.50	National Development Agency (ANDE)	107,450

4. Vehicles and related costs need to be justified for consideration / approval by the PM - please clarify if the budget line includes purchase of motorized vehicles and provide justification for vehicle / related costs.

5. Please explain further in a budget note the budget item "Services for the development of surveys and scaling up of sustainable practices with research institutions (OPA ANDE)" (\$400,000) - and provide further breakdown as appropriate.

6. We will review the budget table again upon resubmission and provide comments as appropriate.

06/02/2026: NOT FULLY ADDRESSED:

1. The submitted version does not comply with the GEF Budget Template found on page 58 of the [Guidelines on the Project Cycle](#). Please use the recommended budget template, following the ?categorization? and including the ?subtotals? per category.

Contractual Services – Individual	Int'l consultant 1							
	Local consultant 1							
Subtotal Contractual Services – Individual								
Contractual Services – Company	Company 1							
Subtotal Contractual Services – Company								

Please resubmit using the correct template.

Agency Response

10 June 2026

Duly noted. The project budget has been inserted using the correct template following categorization and including subtotals.

1. Duly addressed: In line with the recommendations regarding the budget, the following adjustments have been made: The budget has been revised and updated in the GEF template.
2. Personnel costs were adjusted to 30%. The difference in personnel costs (USD 53,800) was reallocated to contractual services.
3. Amended.
4. Please note that this does not include any vehicle rental nor purchase.
5. Duly addressed. The contract item was further disaggregated into three distinct investment lines to support the implementation of pilot actions under Component 2, as follows: Sub-contract to executing partner/entity: Establishment of technology evaluation and validation platforms under a living laboratory approach (ANDE agreement with the INIA?ITTSA?FAGRO consortium) ? USD 100,000. Sub-contract to executing partner/entity: Validation of sustainable practices in family farming and commercial production units under a productive landscape approach (ANDE agreement with the INIA?ITTSA?FAGRO consortium) ? USD 150,000, and a Sub-contract to executing partner/entity: Technical assistance for scaling up sustainable practices at territorial level in the departments of Colonia, Soriano, R?o Negro, and Paysand? (ANDE agreement with the INIA?ITTSA?FAGRO consortium) ? USD 203,800.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following

criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/18/2026: No. Please address comments made in this review.

05/26/2026: The title change is not reflected in the portal. Please change in the portal accordingly.

06/02/2026: No. Please refer to comments on the template for the budget table.

06/10/2026: Yes. Budget table revised.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/7/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/2/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		