GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9739**		
Country/Region:	**Uruguay**		
Project Title:	**Building Institutional and Technical Capacities to Enhance Transparency in the Framework of the Paris Agreement**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**6069 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$25,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,100,000**
Co-financing:	**$760,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,885,000**
PIF Approval:	**March 06, 2017**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Yamil Bonduki**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	MGV, February 22, 2017: Yes the project aligns with CBIT objectives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, February 22, 2017: Yes, the project aligns with Uruguay's FBUR, National Communications, and INDC, in addition to national plans and policies.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MGV, February 22, 2017: Yes	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, February 22, 2017: Yes	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, February 22, 2017: Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, February 22, 2017: Yes	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, February 22, 2017: NA. This project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, February 22, 2017:Yes, PM recommends CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	February 22, 2017	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	MGV, January 25, 2018: There are no changes from what was presented at PIF.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Yes, the project structure is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Yes, the financing is adequate and cost-effective to achieve the project objectives.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	MGV, January 25, 2018: Yes, the project includes risks, which in general have low probability, and proposes appropriate risk measures.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Evidence is provided for co-financing committed by the recipient government; however there is no letter confirming co-financing of $10,000 in-kind by UNDP. Please submit letter. MGV, February 14, 2018: Letter has been submitted. Comment cleared.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Yes, the CBIT tracking tool is completed.	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MGV, January 25, 2018: The project is coordinated with other GEF-funded relevant projects including the Fifth National Communication and Second Biennial Update Report projects, both implemented by UNDP, as well as a recently approved project on low-carbon transport and a National Coastal Adaptation Plan. The project is also coordinated with the National Policy on Climate Change adopted in April 2017 and the associated First NDC submitted in November 2017. Suggest to also include coordination with the GEF-funded project "Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan range lands" implemented by FAO and executed by MGAP, as it may	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		have useful inputs for component 2, in particular regarding emissions from the livestock sector and associated mitigation potential with its climate-smart management, including due to carbon sequestration through restoration. MGV, February 14, 2018: Coordination with this project already envisioned but reference to it corrected. Comment cleared.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Yes, the project described how it will manage and share knowledge from the produced through the project activities. In particular it will share experience and knowledge through peer-learning at a regional level with the NGHGI Latin American Network and globally with the Global Coordination Platform.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	N/A	
	• STAP	N/A	
	• GEF Council	N/A	

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• Convention Secretariat	N/A	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	MGV, January 25, 2018: Please address comment on Box 5 and 8. In addition: - Please fill out indicator 6 under Table E to account for how this project will contribute to the Corporate Targets. - Please fill out the Agency Certification in Part III as included at PIF. - There's a section in the Project Document that has a DRAFT watermark. Please update to ensure it shows the final version. MGV, February 14, 2018: All comments have been cleared. P.M. recommends CEO Approval.	
Review Date	Review	January 25, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 14, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		