



CBIT 2 - Building institutional and technical capacities to meet the commitments under the Paris Agreement?s Enhanced Transparency Framework

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11306

Countries

Uruguay

Project Name

CBIT 2 - Building institutional and technical capacities to meet the commitments under the Paris Agreement?s Enhanced Transparency Framework

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

4/28/2023

Review completed by PM

5/27/2023

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

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

EBF 6/7/2023: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 6/7/2023: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 results?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 7/11/2023: Cleared.

EBF 6/7/2023: Please include a summary of the project components and the number of people benefiting from GEF-financed investments (Indicator 11) in the summary section.

Agency Response Summary section was amended to include the required information.

3. Project Description Overview

- 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?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 7/11/2023:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 6/7/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Please specify the target audience for Output 1.1.2 and 1.2.1.
2. The GEF Project Financing and the Co-financing contributions for PMC correspond to 2.2% and 0.92% of the total GEF grant and total co-financing contributions respectively. Please adjust the co-financing contribution to the PMC so that it is proportional to the GEF project financing contribution.

Agency Response

1. The target audiences have been specified in both Outputs in the Project Description Overview Table.

2. The amount of co-financing contribution for PMC was adjusted to be 2.2% of the total co-financing contribution.

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

EBF 7/11/2023:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared

EBF 6/7/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. The Terminal Evaluation of the first CBIT project in Uruguay (GEF ID 9739) provides a more thorough identification of the main problems and barriers. Considering that this projects should build on its predecessor, we kindly request you to strengthen the description of the current situation, including the main barriers to be addressed by the project.
2. In line with the previous comment, the project description mentions a barrier that is not exactly described in the project rationale:
"The main barriers to achieving the outcomes of the second component are the difficulties in collecting or exchanging data, which are of a great variety and numerous. In some cases, there are no government resources to generate data to monitor actions or assess the economic and social impacts of climate action." Please review and amend, if needed.
3. The description of the Project Components and Outcomes should go in the Project Description, instead of the Project Rationale. Please amend.
4. Although the section "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" clarifies the following "In addition, the execution of this project is expected to coincide with the execution of the project for the preparation of the First and Second BTRs of Uruguay under the ETF, which will be presented to the UNFCCC in 2024 and 2026."
We kindly request you to clarify this earlier, in the Project Description, so that the reader knows that this CBIT project will coincide with the eventual preparation of the preparation of the first and second Biennial Transparency reports.

Agency Response

1. Text under 1.a.1 and 1.a.2 was amended to refer to the results from the Terminal Evaluation of the first CBIT project in Uruguay.
2. The referred barrier is included in the last sentence of section 1.a.1 of the project rationale. The sentence is highlighted in yellow for your reference.

3. It was noted that the Project Components and outcomes description was repeated in the Project Description and in the Project Rationale sections. The full description was deleted from the Project Rationale section. Since the subtitle 1.a.3. under the Project Rationale says: ?Proposed alternative scenario with a description of outcomes and components of the project?, a brief introductory paragraph have been elaborated there.

4. Text was included in Project Description to clarify CBIT project is expected to coincide with the project for the preparation of the First and Second BTRs.

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 thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**
- 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 are 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 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 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

EBF 7/11/2023:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF 6/7/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. The wording of Outcome 2.3 may imply it will prepare the third NDC. Please review the wording and clarify what will be the precise contribution of Outcome 2.3 to the preparation of the third NDC.
2. Please explain what VAT stands for the first time it is mentioned to avoid confusions.

Agency Response

1. The wording of the Outcome 2.3 was modified in the Project Description Overview table, as well as in the PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK table (annex C), and in other references to that Outcome along the text.

2. Text was amended to explain that VAT stands for Value Added Tax.

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

EBF 6/7/2023: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

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 targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core 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

EBF 7/11/2023: Noted. Cleared.

EBF 6/7/2023: The text below the Core Indicators adds up to 115 instead of 100 (15+18+10+10+26+7+11+8+10) people benefiting from the GEF-financed investments. Please review and correct if needed or adjust the wording of the text to avoid confusions.

Agency Response

The first number (15) in the formulae does not add to the sum. 15 is an average number. The figures that we add were: 18 (from the DINACC) plus the exact number of people from other institutions working in each of the 7 working groups (10+10+26+7+11+8+10) = 82. Then, 18 + 82 = 100. This number corresponds to the baseline number of beneficiaries. The target number of beneficiaries is 150, and it was amended in the table.

The reference to the average number in the text was removed to avoid confusion and also, the text was further amended to clarify and avoid confusion.

5.4 Risks

- a) **Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Are the key risks that might affect implementation and adequately rated?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

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 EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

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 N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

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 Request N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?

b) 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 EBF 6/7/2023: No, the project is not requesting PPG.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

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

EBF 7/11/2023:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared

EBF 6/7/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Please confirm if there is only one letter of co-finance (i.e. the one uploaded in the documents section) for the three different co-finance contributions listed in Annex A.
2. The table in Annex A specifies there is an in-kind co-finance contribution of \$504,000 from the National Climate Change and variability Response System (SNRCC). Please clarify what is the need for making this distinction, since it is not specified in the co-finance letter provided by the Ministry of Environment. Please amend the co-finance table in Annex A so it is consistent with the co-finance letter, or provide a new co-finance letter consistent with Annex A.
3. The letter of support from Ministry of Environment indicates \$350,000 as Grant. Please note, Grant is "investment mobilized" normally. Please review if the contributions classified as "recurrent expenditures" need to be changed to "investment mobilized?". Additionally, please describe the investment mobilized portion of this co-financing below the co-financing table.

Agency Response

1. Yes, there is only one letter of co-financing for the \$ 1,100,000 total amount, and the letter distinguish between the \$ 750,000 in kind and the \$ 350,000 in cash (corresponding to the taxes of the project staff salaries)

2. There is no need to make the distinctions since the Ministry of Environment has the Presidency of the SNRCC. The table in Annex A was amended to be consistent with the letter of co-financing.

3. "Recurrent expenditures" have been changed to "investment mobilized" in the classification corresponding to the \$ 350,000 (Grant). Description of investment mobilized was included below the table.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) 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

EBF 7/11/2023: Cleared.

EBF 6/7/2023: It is for the letter of endorsement (LoE) to be signed by the official OFP at the time of the submission to the Secretariat via the Portal. This project was submitted on April 28, 2023,. However, the current OFP (Minister Robert Bouvier) was appointed on February 14, 2023. Please submit a new LoE signed by the current OFP.

Agency Response A new LoE is enclosed.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

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 EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 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 the budget (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 Request

EBF 7/11/2023: Cleared.

EBF 6/7/2023:): Please consider including the target for core indicator 11 in the core indicator table. The CI. 11 target in the results framework (annex A) is 150. To be consistent, please include this target in the core indicator table as well.

Agency Response

We had included 100 in the submitted text because the Core Indicator column title is ?Expected at CEO endorsement? and we had understood it is the baseline value for the indicator, that it is 100. As it is now understood that it corresponds to the target value (which is 150), the value in the table and the text below the table were amended to be consistent.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 6/7/2023: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 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
EBF 7/11/2023:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

EBF 6/7/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Certain text in the first column of the GEF Budget in Annex G is off margins, please correct.
2. The way the budget is presented makes impossible to understand the costs of specific items ? also, there are some overlaps that need to be amended (see examples below) ? please provide the itemized costs of the activities / personnel.
Per the resubmission, we will review and provide comments on the budget if

appropriate.

Training, Workshops, Meetings	Logistics for inception workshop (USD 2,000 in 2023).			-	2,000		2,000	Mini-Environment
Training, Workshops, Meetings	Logistics for local trainings and activities to engage local actors in the implementation of adaptation measures implemented and their monitoring, evaluation, and learning (USD 2,000 per year from 2023 to 2026).		8,000	8,000			8,000	Mini-Environment
Training, Workshops, Meetings	Logistics for local trainings, workshops, meetings or contests to encourage the use of transparency related information and data (USD 4,000 per year from 2023 to 2026) = USD 16,000	16,000		16,000			16,000	Mini-Environment
Training, Workshops, Meetings	Logistics for local trainings, workshops, meetings to encourage the participation in the preparation and implementation of the NDCs (USD 6,000 per year from 2023 to 2026) = USD 24,000.	24,000		24,000			24,000	Mini-Environment
Training, Workshops, Meetings	Logistics for peer-to-peer exchanges with regional or global participation (USD 2,000 in each BTR submission year, 2024 and 2026) = USD 4,000		4,000	4,000			4,000	Mini-Environment

Local Consultants	<p>Includes local consultant's salaries: 1) Transparency and PM consultant USD 3,170 per month, 1 month per year; 2) NGHGI and NDC sectoral consultant #1 (part time) USD 1,585 per month, 2 months per year; 3) Energy sector consultant USD 2,680 per month, 2 months per year; 4) AFOLU sector consultant 2,680 per month, 2 months per year; 5) Adaptation consultant #1 USD 2,800 per month, 2 months per year; 6) Adaptation consultant #2 (part time) 2,380 per month, 2 months per year; 7) Adaptation consultant #3 (part time) 2,380 per month, 2 months per year, starting on July 2023; 8) Economic assessments consultant USD 3,170 per month, 3 months per year; 9) Gender consultant, USD 3,170 per month, 3 months per year, starting on January 2024; 10) KM and outreach consultant (part time) USD 2,380 per month, 3 months per year, starting on January 2024; 11) Private sector engagement consultant (part time), USD 2,380 per month, 2 months per year, starting on January 2024; 12) NGHGI and NDC sectoral consultant #2, USD 3,170 per month, 4 months per year, starting on July 2024; 13) NGHGI and NDC sectoral consultant #3 (part time), USD 2,380 per month, 3 months per year, starting on July 2024; 14) NDC crosscutting issues consultant, USD 3,170 per month, 2 months per year, starting on July 2024. Total = USD 302,732</p> <p>1st year (10 out of 12 months) – (USD 3,170 x 1 months + USD 1,585 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,800 x 2 months + USD 2,800 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months) x 10/12 + USD 2,380 x 2 months x 6/12 = USD 33,155</p> <p>2nd year – (USD 3,170 x 1 months + USD 1,585 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,800 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months) + (USD 3,170 x 4 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 2 months) x 6/12 = USD 76,180</p> <p>3rd and 4th years – USD 3,170 x 1 months + USD 1,585 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,800 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 4 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 2 months = USD 89,260</p> <p>5th Year (2 out of 12 months) – (USD 3,170 x 1 months + USD 1,585 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,680 x 2 months + USD 2,800 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 3 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 2,380 x 2 months + USD 3,170 x 4 months + USD 2,380 x 3 months + USD 3,170 x 2 months) x 2/12 = USD 14,877.</p>	302,732	302,732			302,732	Ministry of Environment etc
-------------------	---	---------	---------	--	--	---------	-----------------------------

Agency Response

1. First column and margin were updated.
2. The budget table was amended to avoid overlaps. The budget amounts and description included in the previous submitted version were disaggregated by subcomponent. For this resubmission the budget is presented by component, so there is only one amount and description per budget line and component.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.11 a) 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.

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 Request N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 7/11/2023: The PM recommends the clearance for CEO Approval.

EBF 6/7/2023: Please address the comments above.

** Please highlight **in green** the changes made on the portal version of the CEO approval document for ease of reference. **

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

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/7/2023	7/7/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/11/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**1SMSP CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)