



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

GEF ID:	5470		
Country/Region:	Uruguay		
Project Title:	Improved Convention Coordination for Sustainable Growth in Uruguay (ECCOSUR)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5226 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-1; CD-2; CD-3; CD-4; CD-5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$90,000	Project Grant:	\$1,862,400
Co-financing:	\$1,863,030	Total Project Cost:	\$3,905,430
PIF Approval:	September 06, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Susan Waithaka	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Tom Twining-Ward-Senier Technical Advisor

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes. Uruguay ratified the CBD on November 5, 1993; the UNFCCC on August 18, 1994 and the UNCCCD on February 17, 1999. Cleared 07/09/2013	Cleared 6/17/2016
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, with letter dated June 17, 2013. Cleared 07/09/2013	Cleared 6/17/2016
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. Cross Cutting Capacity Development allocation.	Yes. CCCD allocation.

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared 07/09/2013	Cleared 6/17/2016
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	N/A	N/A
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Yes. The project is aligned with the Cross-Cutting Capacity Development strategic objectives and results framework. Cleared 07/09/2013</p>	<p>Yes - it still is. Cleared 6/17/2016</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>To some extent. The project is consistent with the National biodiversity Strategy, the Protected Areas Law and other national plans and reports. There's a mention of the consistency of the project with the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) completed for Uruguay in 2006 in another section of the PIF. However, there's no mention of the convention articles (UNCCD, UNFCCC and CBD) that the project is targeting. This is a prerequisite for CCCD projects.</p> <p>Please provide additional information. 07/09/2013</p> <p>21 Aug 2013 UA:</p>	<p>No change. Cleared. 6/17/2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Adequate additional information provided in the Responses to GEFSEC comments.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Not clear. The PIF includes a list of projects and initiatives, but it's not clear what the actual baseline and corresponding amounts are. The baseline has to be specifically described in order to assess how the GEF's increment will contribute to the project's objectives. In addition, it is not clear what the current situation in the country is in terms of mechanisms in place to coordinate the implementation of conventions, to track and report changes and develop/implement necessary response measures if needed.</p> <p>Please provide additional/clear information. 07/09/2013</p> <p>21 Aug 2013 UA: Adequate additional information provided in the Responses to GEFSEC comments.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>No change. Cleared 6/17/2016</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 07/09/2013</p>	<p>Cleared 06/17/2016</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>GEB are explained.</p> <p>Once the baseline is revised, please review the Incrementality of the GEF and clarify the incremental contribution of the</p>	<p>No change. Cleared 6/17/2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF to the baseline if appropriate.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 07/09/2013</p> <p>21 Aug 2013 UA: Adequate additional information provided in the Responses to GEFSEC comments.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. 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/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>Through project interventions, national and international stakeholders, including private sector and civil society, will gain a better appreciation of the links between the global environmental issues and national development priorities, in particular of the socio-economic risks associated to global environmental impacts. Furthermore, through the specific activities proposed at the local level, the project is expected to improve capacities of local decision-makers and municipal staff, as well as promoting capacity building that would enhance the participation and empowerment of under-represented, socially vulnerable or disadvantaged groups.</p> <p>Through training, as well as integrated Convention-related subprojects and scholarships, community benefits will involve support to rural and urban organizations, families and individuals (mainly students), where gender consideration will represent an integral part of the eligibility and selection criteria, in order to ensure active and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>equal participation of females in project activities.</p> <p>Cleared 6/17/2016</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Yes. The project will be executed by a CSO consortium and there are mechanisms defined for the participation of civil society organizations. Cleared 07/09/2013</p>	<p>Stakeholder participation in project implementation has experienced substantial changes with respect to the arrangements proposed in the endorsed PIF. While the proposed arrangements established that project implementation would be fully undertaken by Civil Society led by the ECOS Foundation, the preparation process encouraged the Steering Committee to decide that the responsibilities of the Implementing Partner (IP) should be transferred from the ECOS Foundation to the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA). In the opinion of the members of the Steering Committee, these new arrangements would allow for a more active participation of the Focal Points for the Conventions, as well as taking advantage of the relevant experience of MVOTMA and DINAMA (the Environmental Directorate under MVOTMA) in the management and administration of UNDP-implemented GEF projects. Furthermore, the Steering Committee has concluded that these arrangements would further contribute to maximize the synergies between the public sector and CSOs, an essential condition for the achievement of the capacity building objectives and outcomes of the project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared 6/17/2016
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 07/09/2013	Yes cleared. 6/17/2016
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 07/09/2013	Yes. A full list of other relevant activities ongoing has been provided. Cleared. 6/17/2016
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Project innovative aspects include: a) Model for effective public-private partnership; b) integration of global environmental issues in development; c) bottom up approach to convention implementation, among others.</p> <p>Sustainability of the project's outcomes will be ensured by the strengthened capacities of public and non-stake actors, the consultative process with relevant stakeholders during the PPG phase as well as the solid normative and institutional baseline.</p> <p>Replication will be achieved in three dimensions: at the central level, local level and regional and global level.</p> <p>Cleared 07/09/2013</p>	Cleared 6/17/2016
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes - the changes at the implementing partner level have been explained. Cleared 6/17/2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>The cost-effectiveness of this project lies largely in the project strategy, namely by building upon a significant baseline and leveraged commitment. This cost-effectiveness is demonstrated by the significant co-financing to project activities in the order of US\$ 1.863 million in Uruguay. Although largely in-kind, a substantial portion of this contribution is real financial resources, taking into account the significant investment of government and civil society staff to actively participate in project activities.</p> <p>Cleared 6/17/2016</p>
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Cleared 07/09/2013	Yes cleared 6/17/2016
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>Yes. The project includes significant cash and in-kind co-financing.</p> <p>Cleared 07/09/2013</p>	<p>Yes letter have been provided for the co-financing.</p> <p>Cleared 6/17/2016</p>
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 07/09/2013	Yes cleared 6/17/2016
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> ,	A PPG of \$98,550 (inclusive of Agency fees) is included and is appropriate for the design level.	Yes cleared. 6/17/2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes a detailed M&E incising indicators from the Capacity Building Scorecard has been prepared and will be implemented. Cleared 6/17/2016
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes A budgeted M&E plan has been prepared. Cleared 6/17/2016
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this stage. Additional clarifications and information are requested as per the points above.</p> <p>07/09/2013</p> <p>21 Aug 2013 UA: Adequate additional information provided. The Program Manager recommends the project for CEO clearance and the PPG for CEO approval. PLEASE NOTE: Items to consider at CEO endorsement below.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>21 Aug 2013 UA:</p> <p>1) The CEO endorsement documents will need to provide a detailed budget breakdown and justification for the requested GEF funds.</p> <p>2) The project should be designed in a way that there is a sound balance between public and private, governmental and non-governmental, national and local institutions being recipients of project support, in particular of the capacity building (reference is made to the stakeholder section of the PIF, which states that national government institutions DINAMA and MVOTMA will be the primary recipients).</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>Yes - documents have been provided.</p> <p>The project is being recommended for CEO approval.</p>
	First review*	July 09, 2013	June 19, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 2013	
	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.**