

Land Degradation Neutrality for Sustainable Use and Conservation of Uruguay Rangelands

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11061

Countries

Uruguay

Project Name

Land Degradation Neutrality for Sustainable Use and Conservation of Uruguay
Rangelands

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/2/2023

Review completed by PM

6/30/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

a) and b). Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) The Outcome 1.2 and its related outputs are missing in the table under the Indicative Project Overview. The output 4.2.1 is also missing in the table. Please complete the table and ensure the table includes all the same outcomes and outputs as in the Project Description.

June 8, 2023:

No, the output 4.2.1 is still missing. Please complete the table as needed.

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for completing the table. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

Table has been updated to include missing outputs.

25 Apr

a) No response required

b) Apologies for the omission when copy-pasting the PIF into the portal. The missing outcomes and outputs are now in the Project Overview.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

a) The total resources including GEF funds and co-financing allocated to restoration (component 3) seems low and those allocated to component 1 very high (\$4.750 million for capacity building?). Also, investments in cash are needed to implement restoration but only \$1.4 million of co-financing is expected to be as public investments or grant. Please justify the funds allocated to the components and their nature and ensure they are adequate considering the planned activities.

b) Yes, around 5% of both the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing are allocated to PMC. Cleared.

c) With only 5% of the total GEF grant, the requested PMC is well below the cap of 10% for an MSP. Cleared.

June 8, 2023:

a) Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless the Agency response is not consistent with the changes in the Indicative Project Overview: GEF resources were not moved from component 1 to component 3, but from component 1 to component 4. Please amend the Indicative Project Overview table as indicated in the Agency response.

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

a) Resources were moved from component 1 to component 3 (\$60k, from GEFTF) according to our previous comment.

b and c) No response required

25 Apr 2023

a) Component 1 will be key to creating the enabling environment to mobilize resources from the private sector, therefore a small amount of resources were moved from Component 1 to Component 3 (\$60k, from GEFTF) and from Comp.1 to Comp. 3 (\$410k, from Cofinancing). Under component 1, the project expects to mobilize the local cooperatives (i.e. Cooperativas Agrarias Federadas and Asociacion Uruguay de Ganaderos de Pastizal), which will translate into field investments under component 3. These field investments are not yet quantified but will be confirmed during project design.

b) No response required

c) Noted, we will evaluate if the OP needs more resources to budget to 10%

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

a)

- In paragraph 8, please discuss the linkage with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) targets, not the Aichi Targets.

- Please clarify the process that was applied to distinguish the three watersheds as Key Biodiversity Areas per the IUCN guidelines on KBAs.

b) Yes, cleared.

June 8, 2023:

a)

- Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

- We don't find the information in paragraph 38 and there is no footnote (42) in paragraph 8. Please clarify where the additional information can be found.

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

Apologies, numbers were shifted with the copy-pasting action. The numbering has been modified accordingly. The sentence we are referring to is in paragraph 36 and footnote 40.

25 Apr 2023

a)

- paragraph 8 was changed to link to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) targets

- In Paragraph 38, a sentence clarifying the process to select the 3 watersheds was included. Indeed, the area of KBA was considered as a key criterion. In project location (annex C), a table with the % of KBA by watershed is presented. In addition, for the estimation of the Core Indicators, the area of degraded grasslands within Key biodiversity areas (KBAs) that are not protected in the project area, was performed using the multicriteria analysis of the Project Design Decision Support System developed for the project (<https://projectgeffao.users.earthengine.app/view/uruguay>). The resulting map is presented in the Core Indicators Section (Figure 6) of the PIF (word version).

The KBA data used corresponds to the BirdLife International (2021) World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas. Developed by the KBA Partnership: BirdLife International, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, American Bird Conservancy, Amphibian Survival Alliance, Conservation International, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, Global Environment Facility, Global Wildlife Conservation, NatureServe, Rainforest Trust, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Wildlife Conservation Society and World Wildlife Fund. March 2021 version. More information: <http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/>

A footnote (42) added in paragraph 8 explaining the relevance of the watersheds and linking it to the national water plan

b) No response required

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) It is unclear whether the proposal will ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers. Please clarify.

c) Yes, cleared.

d) Stakeholders related to grasslands are mentioned in general terms. Please briefly describe all the stakeholders targeted in the project being more specific on their respective roles (producers, academics, government, legislators, cooperatives, municipal governments, research institutions...).

July 18, 2023:

b) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

d) It is well note that the project includes information on stakeholder consultations during PIF design. The project however does not provide information on their relevant roles to project outcomes or plan to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO endorsement. Please elaborate on this further.

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared

Agency's Comments

26 July 2023

d) Noted on the provision of information on the role of stakeholders to project outcomes and the development of a stakeholder engagement plan.

Please refer to the stakeholder engagement section where the development of a Stakeholder Engagement Plan during the design phase (ie. PPG phase) has been mentioned.

Also, the table summarizing stakeholder consultations now provides information on their roles in the project (outcomes and components).

25 Apr 2023

a) No response required

b) The following text was added as Paragraph 13:

Collaborative and evidence-based policy-making initiatives can help integrate knowledge and facilitate adaptive planning in relation to land degradation, biodiversity conservation and climate change. Particularly in socio-agro-pastoral systems, LD manifests itself in various forms and at different scales (country, landscape, estate) with the involvement of different stakeholder groups (e.g., land users, technical advisors, managers, and policy makers). The integration of different knowledge systems (e.g., traditional, local, scientific) and the joint generation of new knowledge often leads to more robust agricultural policy decisions towards addressing climate change, biodiversity conservation and LD.

Knowledge sharing can also facilitate more appropriate responses to the needs of local communities and protect their livelihoods and well-being. The experience of implementing the PRAGA methodology at pilot scale in Uruguay, highlighted the challenges of understanding the drivers and possible policy options by stakeholders. This understanding is a necessary but not sufficient condition for planning and decision making in dynamic situations. Therefore, rather than focusing on a policy response to the degradation problem, the focus of this project is on building institutional capacities that derive from the processes of collective diagnosis and proposing solutions, as well as their implementation, following up and monitoring. These capacities include policy responses to the current situation, but also install in the country's institutionality, the ability to follow up on implementation and to re-evaluate and re-direct policies in future situations, ensuring resilience to future changes in the drivers

c) No response required

d) Stakeholder Engagement section has been re-worked in response to the observation.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

- a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?
- b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

- a) The strategic fit with the BDFA is not strongly articulated. We do not see a clear description of spatial or land use plans that incorporate conservation of globally important biodiversity as a criterion. There are no clear measurable outputs for spatial or land-use plans at all. Please clarify.
- b) Yes, cleared.

June 8, 2023:

- a) Thank you for clarifying the objective of the project now aligned and fully supported by LDFA. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

- a) While the country allocated STAR resources from the BD and LD focal areas, the project will focus on Land Degradation. Nonetheless, the Project will adopt a landscape approach and will provide co-benefits in terms of sustainable use of biodiversity such as the development of law on conservation and management of grasslands (including natural grasslands that are KBAs) and the monitoring of grasslands (in alignment to LDN targets). Text has been edited to reflect the LD Focal Area as the target focal area.
- b) No response required

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

a) The institutional setting, including potential executing partners, and its rationale is unclear. Please clarify.

b) The GEF Agency doesn't expect to play an execution role on this project. Cleared.

c) 2 GEF funded projects are mentioned under the project justification but the modalities for coordination and cooperation with these projects and eventually with other relevant bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area remain unclear. Please elaborate further on this aspect which is important to develop synergies and increase efficiency.

d) Yes, cleared.

June 8, 2023:

a) Thank you for the additional information which is actually in paragraphs 37-39 (and not 52-53). Cleared.

c) We don't find the paragraph 54 and the section under the title "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" is empty. Please ensure this comment is addressed, mentioning explicitly the relevant the GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area. Please also indicate clearly where the additional information can be found.

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

a) No response required.

c) Apologies, numbers were shifted during the copy-pasting actions. The numbering has been modified accordingly. Please see paragraph 52.

Paragraphs 57-60 were added to the section "Coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiative and project".

25 Apr 2023

a) The institutional and coordination arrangements were clarified in paragraphs 52-53

b) No response required

c) Clarified in paragraph 54

d) No response required

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

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

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

a) For the GHG emission avoided estimate, the total duration of accounting should be 20 years and not 14 years. Please adjust accordingly.

b) Yes, but the biodiversity benefits are unclear and the LD benefit appear relatively low considering the resources allocated of +\$3 million in component 3 (including co-financing). Please clarify the biodiversity targets in the project description and consider the possibility for a more ambitious benefit in terms of reversing/preventing land degradation.

June 2023:

a) Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the clarification and the targets increase. Below the core indicators table, please also update the description on how the expected benefits were calculated. The current description corresponds to the previous targets.

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for the update. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

June 8 2023

a) No response required

b) Description has been updated

25 Apr 2023

a) Estimates were adjusted to a total duration of accounting of 20 years, therefore changing from 1,248,051 to 1,787,179 tons of CO₂ of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated.

b) As discussed above the project targets the LD focal area, though it will have BD co-benefits. LD benefits have been increased to include co-financing and potential resource mobilization from the private sector. These were calculated using an average cost of \$300 per hectare are distributed as follows:

CI3: 4,000 ha restored (increased from 1,000 in first draft of the PIF), corresponding to:

? 1,000 ha using GEFTF resources

? 2,000 ha using cofinancing

? 1,000 ha from private sector (ie. cooperative) resources not yet included in the cofinancing

CI4: 15,000 ha under improved practices including avoided and reduced degradation. The project is targeting the 120,000 ha converted per year. This target is expected to increase during preparation once commitments have been made by the private sector.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

a), b), and c) Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

- a) Yes, cleared.
- b) Please elaborate further on the potential for scaling-up of the project.
- c) Yes, cleared.

June 8, 2023:

- b) Thank you for the additional information provided in paragraphs 40-43 (and not 55-58). Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

- a) No response required
- b) paragraphs 55-58 were added (under subheading Innovation and Scaling up)
- c) No response required

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

No, as described the proposal seems to be more of a mainly LDN project and the alignment with the BD FA is unclear. Please make a much stronger case on the biodiversity objectives to justify the BD global significance argument and produce a land use/spatial plan that incorporates BD. In particular please clarify how the project will

target restoration to meet this criterion of the GEF BDFA strategy: ?opportunities to restore areas to ensure the persistence of globally significant biodiversity will be supported.? Currently this is not clear.

June 8, 2023:

Thank you for the clearer alignment of the project with LDFA objectives. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

The Project was conceived as an LDN project with BD and CC cobenefits. Therefore alignment with LDFA has been strengthened and cobenefits have been highlighted in the text, including expected project contribution to the Kunming-Montreal GBF.

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's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

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's Comments

February 27, 2023:

In the section ?ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES? please discuss what targets in the GBF the project will contribute to (if the project confirms its ambition in terms of biodiversity benefits).

June 8, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

The project is aligned with the LD Focal Area and will produce BD and CC co-benefits. This has been clarified in this section, including how the project will contribute to the GBF.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

It is indicated that Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities have been consulted but it is unclear who precisely from these groups has been consulted and when. Please clarify.

June 8, 2023:

It remains unclear who from Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities have been consulted and when. Please clarify where exactly the relevant text has been updated and ensure it is about Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities.

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

Indigenous People are not a target of this project, but Local Communities are. Consultations with direct beneficiaries have been carried out and reported in the list of consultations, this includes the Federated Agrarian Cooperatives and the Asociación Uruguaya de Ganaderos del Pastizal.

25 Apr 2023

The text on the stakeholder section has been updated.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) is in line with GEF policies and guidelines and it is within the resources available. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes but the level of ambition for the ratio of Investment Mobilized to GEF Project Financing is far from the 5:1 expected at portfolio level for a country like Uruguay. During the PPG phase, please consider increasing the level of Investment Mobilized. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

Noted.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Yes. The OFP has changed but the Minister Adrian Pe?a Robaina who signed the Letter of Endorsement was still the OFP when the PIF was submitted. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

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

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Yes, a web link is provided leading to geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions are expected to take place. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

Depending on the clarification provided on the importance of BD focus and alignment with BD FA strategy, please revise accordingly the Rio Marker on Biodiversity.

June 8, 2023:

As LD focus is the main objective of the project, please rate the Land Degradation Rio Marker as 2 (instead of 1).

June 30, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

Noted, rating has been changed to 2

25 Apr 2023

Rio Markers have been reclassified as 1 (Significant objective)

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

February 16, 2023:

In Annex F, project taxonomy, why is biodiversity entirely missing if the project is supported 50% by BDFA resources? Please clarify.

June 8, 2023:

The taxonomy is now aligned with the project LD main objective. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

Project focuses on LDFA

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

No response required

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

Overall, the project may best be presented as LDN project, with some co-benefits for biodiversity, but as currently presented and argued, the project title "Land Degradation Neutrality for Biodiversity Conservation of Uruguay Rangelands" doesn't seem to fit with the content of the proposal. Perhaps it should be titled as "Achieving Land Degradation Neutrality in Uruguay Rangelands".

June 8, 2023:

Not yet, please address the remaining comments. In doing so, please revise the numbering of the paragraphs which is currently discontinued and which doesn't correspond to the Agency responses, making the review more difficult. Also, as suggested in the last review, please consider a project title more aligned with the project content, so with less focus on the biodiversity objective (which is a co-benefit). As formulated now, the biodiversity conservation appears to be the main objective of the project which is not really the case.

July 18, 2023:

Thank you for addressing the comments and adjusting the project title. Please address the remaining comment above on stakeholders engagement.

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comment. The PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

8 June 2023

Comments have been addressed.

Paragraphs have been updated and title has been changed to "**Land Degradation Neutrality for Sustainable Use and Conservation of Uruguay Rangelands**".

25 Apr 2023

While this project was conceived as an LDN program, it is expected to produce BD benefits. The government of Uruguay will align efforts from both the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture in order to ensure that the LDN framework creates synergies across sectors and strengthens management of resources in Key Biodiversity Areas within the project area. In this context, they would like to keep the title proposed to reflect its cross-cutting nature.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

February 27, 2023:

During the PPG phase, please consider increasing the level of Investment Mobilized.

Agency's Comments

25 Apr 2023

Noted. We will revise the cofinancing and expect to mobilize resources from the private sector during project preparation

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	2/27/2023	4/25/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/8/2023	6/8/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/18/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		