



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>4871</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Uruguay</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Updating the National Biodiversity Strategy and Developing the Action Plan to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4814 (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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$220,800</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$224,800</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$445,600</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
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	March 20, 2012 Uruguay became party to the CBD in 1993.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * <sup>1</sup>	March 20, 2012 Letter from the OFP Maria Valeria Perez Guida dated February 15, 2012.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	March 20, 2012 UNDP's experience in implementing biodiversity enabling activities is acknowledged both regionally and internationally.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	March 20, 2012 UNDP's Montevideo office has a complement of four technical staff within the Environment and Energy portfolio plus operational, support and senior management staff.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	

<sup>1</sup> Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.  
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	March 20, 2012 No funds requested from STAR.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	March 20, 2012 No funds requested from STAR.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	March 20, 2012 The proposal requests a GEF grant of \$220,800, which is aligned with the cost benchmarks for use of FA set-aside funding for NBSAP revision as recommended by the GEF Secretariat.
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	March 20, 2012 Yes aligned with FA framework.
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	March 20, 2012 Aligned with BD-5.
	8. 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?	March 20, 2012 Yes, NBSAP not updated since 1999 and latest reports have identified the lack of Aichi Target coverage.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	March 20, 2012 The project will mainstream biodiversity considerations, improve incentives and remove barriers to incorporating the value of ecosystem services into development planning. It includes strategy development for resource mobilization for NBSAP implementation.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	March 20, 2012 Well aligned with CBD guidance on NBSAP revision.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	March 20, 2012 Includes gender considerations with performance targets for Yr 2 and project end.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	March 20, 2012 Yes provision for participation at a number of levels.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	March 20, 2012 Yes, other relevant initiatives with which it will be coordinated are mentioned.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	March 20, 2012 Yes based around the UNDP modality of national implementation, DINAMA-MVOTMA is the designated executing agency.
		15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Financing		<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>Adjustment made.</p>
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 20, 2012</p> <p>The components appear to be adequately funded.</p>
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	<p>March 20, 2012</p> <p>Co-finance is \$224,800 of which 69% is in cash form.</p>
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	<p>March 20, 2012</p> <p>UNDP is not providing co-finance.</p>
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	<b>20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	March 20, 2012 Not at this stage please address Q15.
		March 27, 2012 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review**	March 20, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 28, 2012
	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.**