



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>4841</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Uruguay</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening the Effectiveness of the National Protected Area System by Including a Landscape Approach to Management.</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4832 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,621,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$7,179,475</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$8,800,475</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ian Gray</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jose Troya</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	March 16, 2012 Yes, Uruguay became party to the CBD in 1993.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 16, 2012 Yes, letter from OFP Maria Valeria Perez Guida dated February 29, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	March 16, 2012 Yes, UNDP's history in similar projects is acknowledged in the region and internationally. UNDP is also already implementing the original SNAP project "Catalyzing the implementation of Uruguay's national Protected Area System".	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	March 16, 2012 There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	March 16, 2012 The UNDAF Priority 2 includes conservation of natural resources and specifies development of policies and programs to conserve ecosystems particularly through the SNAP.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	March 15, 2012 As at March 16, 2012 FA amounts remaining were: BD \$1.99, LD \$0.63 and CC \$3.47.	
	• the focal area allocation?	March 16, 2012 Yes, the proposed grant is within the BD allocation.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	March 16, 2012 Yes, generally well aligned.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	March 16, 2012 A single FA Objective is identified Objective 1. Given the work on sustainable finance plans it is suggested that FA Outcome 1.2 is added in order to address Output 3. Please add this as a separate row in Table A with indicative	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>grant amount and indicative co-finance identified for each Outcome.</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>The 4th National Report includes the plan to increase the area under SNAP from 0.35% to 0.6% by 2013 and 1.2% by 2015. The plan for the SNAP 2010-14 includes an objective of developing the PA network and integrating into sustainable development planning.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>Capacity development is included in incorporating biodiversity into spatial and sector planning for staff within DINAMA and DINOT. Operational Manuals and Guidance will be prepared for agricultural and ranching production systems, but it is not clear how these will be promoted within private land owners and managers. Please describe what capacity development is included for field-level operations.</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided. Please ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement, this is more comprehensively articulated.</p>	
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>The SNAP was established in 2000 and continues to create new and incorporate existing PAs, but still only covers less</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sound data and assumptions?	than 0.5% of terrestrial area. DINAMA investment of \$6.7 million in SNAP and PAs plus \$1.8 million towards spatial LUPs from regional governments.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>Yes, SNAP progress is ongoing but limited in extent and slow to increase. Additionally given Uruguay's historic land use, landscapes are highly modified and increasingly intensively managed. The PA system are therefore fragmented and increasingly isolated both spatially and through the intensity of the land use management in agricultural and commercial forestry areas.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>Generally yes, the project has two components: adapting national and sub-national land use frameworks for biodiversity considerations, and integration of PA and BD management in selected landscapes.</p> <p>a) Please clarify the extent of PAs and landscapes that will be impacted by the project. It is difficult to identify exactly what is proposed for example Component 2 Outcome mentions 5 PAs and 120k ha but only 2 PAs and 100k ha is identified in the Outputs.</p> <p>b) Please provide a little more detail on</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>what is being proposed in terms of sustainable financing plans. Component 1 has a system wide target but what is being proposed in Component 2 at the individual PAs? Additionally, please provide a little more detail on what is expected as a result of the development of the plans, particularly what is meant by investment programs and incentives. c) PES are given a brief mention in the framework and the text. If PES are being considered please provide additional detail on how these will be developed and also how STAP guidance on PES is being incorporated.</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>The text gives the impression of quite extensive planning but limited field level implementation in Component 2, please provide a little more detail on what is expected in terms of changing practices within the privately owned areas.</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>The description of socio-economic benefits is relatively generic. How does the project deal with the potential of enhanced PA management to restrict livelihood opportunities? If PES are</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	additional benefits?	<p>being anticipated please provide additional detail as requested in Q14.</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>NGOs are generically identified in B.5, fuller details are expected at CEO Endorsement. Does the project include a role for agriculture or forestry associations?</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>Generic risks are identified. Please provide consideration of the potential risk and mitigation for lack of support from private land users and managers.</p> <p>March 27, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>Yes existing GEF projects identified as well as ongoing IADB and WB initiatives.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>DINAMA is identified as executing agency. Please provide additional information on the roles of actors at field-level in particular in changing private land owners' management techniques.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	March 16, 2012 PMC is 9.5% which is with the acceptable limits for projects under \$2 million in value.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 16, 2012 Yes, funds seem appropriate but please provide detail as requested in Q15 on the extent of field-level activities.  March 27, 2012  Adequate revision provided.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	March 16, 2012 Co-finance is at 1:4.36 of which \$5.28 (73%) is in grant form.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	March 16, 2012 UNDP is providing co-finance of \$303,661 in grant form, equal to 18.7% of total project costs.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>March 16, 2012 Not at this stage, please address the issues above.</p> <p>March 27, 2012 Adequate revisions have been provide on all issues, PIF is being recommended for CEO approval.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 16, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL



Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.