



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
 TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands			
Country(ies):	Uruguay	GEF Project ID: ¹	9153
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	636320
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)	Submission Date:	27/11/17
		Resubmission Date:	07/03/18
		Resubmission Date:	10/04/18
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	48
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	198,719

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
CCM-2 Program 4 (select) (select)	Outcome A. Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration Outcome B. Policy, planning and regulatory frameworks foster accelerated low GHG development and emissions mitigation	GEFTF	1,481,781	10,088,476
LD-1 Program 2(select) (select) (select)	1. Maintain and improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods	GEFTF	610,000	4,153,091
Total project costs			2,091,781	14,241,567

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and climate change mitigation through the promotion of multifunctional sustainable forest management in productive forest landscapes						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1 Strengthening the institutional framework and national capacities to implement the Climate Smart Livestock Management (CSLM).	TA	1. Policy and planning frameworks have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation and national communication on livestock emissions.	1.1.1: A national CSLM strategy, designed and validated with key stakeholders. 1.1.2: A Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA), including a national measuring, reporting	GEFTF	257,029	2,531,694

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF and CBIT programming directions.

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

			and validation (MRV) system for the livestock ruminant sector.			
	TA	1.2 National capacities have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation.	<p>1.2.1: Capacities developed to effectively support the implementation of CSLM with a gender-sensitive perspective.</p> <p>1.2.2. A training program in place, to supporting the rolling out of improved and climate- smart approaches to livestock management.</p>	GEFTF	115,235	483,998
2. Development and deployment of CSLM technologies and practices at field level.	TA	2.1 Sustainable CSLM has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands.	<p>2.1.1: Short and medium-term farm level strategies implemented on project farms with a gender perspective.</p> <p>2.1.2 A capacity development program focused on the application of the CSLM technologies and practices.</p> <p>2.1.3: On-farm monitoring system, in place to monitor GHG emissions, adaptation strategies, financing, land degradation and biodiversity.</p>	GEFTF	1,229,350	10,100,697
3. Monitoring, evaluation and knowledge sharing.	TA	3.1 Project implementation based on RBM and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated.	<p>3.1.1: A set of manuals and media products that describe the improved CSLM practices, measures and technologies, for use by extension workers and farmers.</p> <p>3.1.2: Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and system in place.</p> <p>3.1.3: Knowledge-sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and</p>	GEFTF	390,558	1,015,178

		tested methodologies.			
		3.1.4: Project Mid-term review and Final Evaluatio.			
		3.1.5: A Communication Strategy implemented.			
Subtotal				1,992,172	14,131,567
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴			(select)	99,609	110,000
Total project costs				2,091,781	14,241,567

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Government	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)	Cash	8,950,000
Government	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)	In-Kind	2,660,000
Government	Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVOTMA)	In-Kind	178,250
Government	University of the Republic, Faculty of Agriculture	In-Kind	670,000
Farmer's Organization	National Commission for Rural Development (CNFR)	In-Kind	49,315
Public-Private Institution	Institute for Agricultural Planning (IPA)	In-Kind	378,000
Public-Private Institution	National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIA)	In-Kind	796,000
International Organization	Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)	Cash	100,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash	360,002
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind	100,000
Total Co-financing			14,241,567

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	Uruguay	CCM	N/A	1,481,781	140,769	1,622,550
FAO	GEF TF	Uruguay	LD	N/A	610,000	57,950	667,950
Total Grant Resources					2,091,781	198,719	2,290,500

a) Refer to the Fec Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	<i>hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>35,000 hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>Number of freshwater basins</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	<i>5,910,000 metric tons</i>
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Fund) in Annex D.

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the *GEF-6 Programming Directions*, will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1. *Project Description.* Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing; 5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed;

In the preparation phase, it became evident that the institutional framework of the livestock sector in Uruguay is strong in the public, private and academic sectors. However, despite the strong institutionality, and efforts by the government to coordinate the many initiatives through the extended National Grassland Board (MGCN), there is a lack of common vision on climate-smart livestock development which hinders the coordination and development of synergies. The barrier to be addressed is thus not the institutional weakness, but the lack of an interinstitutional strategy on CSLM. This will be addressed by the project through the development of a national strategy through a process which involves all members of the MGCN (output 1.1.1), and a dedicated programme to build institutional capacities of key actors to mainstream the strategy into institutional policies and programmes.

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects,

In the preparation phase, several additional baseline projects were identified which will yield lessons, offer a platform for replication and dissemination of findings, and provide co-financing (please see table 3). The most important baseline initiatives are the extended Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Climate Change (DACC-2) project which will provide on-farm investments, technical assistance and training to some 2,500 family producers, some 500 medium-sized producers and more than 2,000 producers through direct support to 40 producer organizations and thus the main structure for upscaling of the GEF field activities (component 2). The project will benefit from several dedicated research activities, notably the Natural Rangelands, Extensive Livestock, and Greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration projects by INIA, and the Co-innovation, Technologies and Strategies for livestock farmers in Tacuarembó implemented by the Faculty of Agriculture. These will provide inputs to the co-innovation methodology (Output 2.1.1) and the on-farm monitoring system (output 2.1.3) Finally, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)'s project on reducing enteric methane for food security and livelihoods will build complementary capacities for monitoring and mitigation of enteric methane, and disseminate project findings to a worldwide audience.

3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁸ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project,

The project's theory of change hinges on the application of the co-innovation approach. The co-innovation approach which has been successfully proposed and applied in Uruguay in participatory processes of innovation of family production systems in horticultural, horticultural-livestock and livestock systems. The co-innovation approach combines three fundamental elements i) A systems approach, ii) social learning, and iii) dynamic project monitoring. The interaction between these three domains constitutes the definition of 'co-innovation' that

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

⁸ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

will be applied to the development of climate-smart livestock in small- and medium scale family farms in Uruguay.

Co-innovation is based on a vision of the farm as a complex adaptive system. It is a new way to operationalize technological change. The sustainability of family farms cannot be improved by adjusting or modifying isolated components of the system but requires adjustment of the production system as a whole. This in turn implies changes in the knowledge, attitudes, abilities and aspirations (of the people involved in the decision-making process. In this new paradigm changes in agricultural practices and in the organization of systems towards situations of greater sustainability (socio-economic and environmental) are seen as a result of a collective learning process called "co-innovation" (Botha et al. al., 2016; Coutts et al., 2016). The active participation of producers in the process of identifying problems and alternatives for improvement is considered fundamental to achieve the desired impacts.

MGAP's policy embraces the co-innovation approach as a comprehensive method for working with farmers and promote innovation. It covers the technological aspects but also the human relations and social aspects of innovation. It considers the farm as a system, which is especially relevant when dealing with the promotion of environmental practices. It has been proven useful in Uruguay both in horticulture and livestock farmers, including small farms which had not been impacted by other methods. Methods which focus on promoting isolated practices and measures within the farm or do not consider farmers motivations, aspirations and goals, have proven to be ineffective to promote a change in the productive paradigm, as the GEF project seeks to achieve.

The Co-innovation approach allows adopting the CSLM strategy to unforeseen climatic situations. From the analysis of the practices and techniques that make up the technological path towards climate-smart livestock (described in section 1.4.2), it can be concluded that they are not "turnkey" technologies whose adoption depends simply on a good communication system and propaganda combined with credit or subsidy policies that facilitate the "purchase" of technology by producers. On the contrary, initiating a sustained virtuous spiral towards more resilient family farming systems in the face of climate change, more productive and more environmentally friendly systems, require a process that meets at least two fundamental conditions:

a) be adaptable to the enormous diversity existing among producers in the availability of resources, in the conditions in which they have to produce, in the strategies they prefer and in the objectives they seek. Therefore, technological proposals must be able to adapt to this diversity by creating viable alternatives for different situations, combining and adapting the available techniques to create solutions for each particular situation. You cannot promote 'prototypes' or optimal 'packages' against which the alternative proposed to the farmer is 'take it or leave it'. This requires a participatory process in which producers and technicians interact on an equal footing in the construction of the farm's innovation plan and in its implementation and evaluation. Continuous monitoring and continuous assessment tools will be developed and applied.

b) Changes in the magnitude implied by the objective of this project are not possible without profound changes in the way of doing things and making decisions by the actors involved, especially producers and technical advisors. To change the behaviors of human beings, individual and collective learning processes are required. The proposal towards the construction of climate-smart livestock will prioritize and promote learning processes as a basis to achieve the changes in behaviors sought. These learning processes are evolutionary processes through which the diversity of new ideas generated are evaluated and discarded or reformulated and included in the current practices of each farm.

4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCE, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing;

The allocation of GEF funds to the financing of the outcomes remains almost unchanged. Total co-financing has increased from 12,030,000 USD to 14,241,567 USD. This is mainly due to an increased commitment of the

Ministry for Livestock, which includes a substantial contribution of the DACC-2 project to component 2, as well as new commitments by the Faculty of Agriculture / University of the Republic (670,000 USD) and the Institute of Agricultural Planning (378,000 USD), and the CCAC (100,000 USD). On the other hand, the contribution by the Government of New Zealand foreseen in the PIF cannot be considered as the funding of the Uruguay Family Farm Improvement Project ends in 2017. Apart from CNFR which has committed co-financing, FUCREA and AUGAP have pledged participation through the MGCN and at local level, which underlines their commitment as stakeholders in the project. Another difference with the PIF concerns the distribution of the co-financing commitments across the components. There is a notable increase of cofinancing for component 2 (from 5.2 m USD to 10 m USD) and a slight increase of component 3 (0.8 to 1 m USD). On the other hand, co-funding for component 1 has decreased (from 5.3 to 3 m USD). This is mainly due the strong focus of the co-financing on field activities which will benefit from the CSLM capacities installed under the GEF project. Another strong focus of the co-financing activities is in support of the on-farm monitoring system (output 2.1.3), as well as activities to support dissemination and learning (component 3).

5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); and

Climate Change Mitigation:

The calculation of carbon benefits was thoroughly revised during project preparation using IPCC Tier 1 and Tier 2 methodologies. over two time scales: 1. the project lifetime (4 years) and 2. the timeframe recommended by IPCC for LULUCF projects (20 years). In the direct intervention area (35,000 ha on 60 farms) the total reduction in GHG emissions (including CH₄ and N₂O emissions from livestock, and C sequestration on grassland and forests) is estimated to be 119,000 t CO_{2eq}. (over 4 years) and 775,000 t CO_{2eq} (over 20 years). (Estimate at PIF stage: 100,000-300,000 t CO_{2eq}). In the indirect intervention area (400,000 ha, ca 680 farms supported by the DACC-2 project) the reduction is 260,000 t CO_{2eq}. (4 years) and 5,135,000 t CO_{2eq} (20 years).₂ (Estimate at PIF stage: 1-3 million t CO_{2eq}) The total mitigation effect of the project thus amounts to 379,000 t CO_{2eq}. (4 years) and 5,911,000 t CO_{2eq} (20 years).₂ The lower estimate in the indirect area can be explained by the lower adoption curve of the farmers who indirectly benefit from the project.

Notably, the GHG emissions intensity in kg CO_{2eq} per kg live weight is expected to decrease by 70 % from 24 to 7, in line with Uruguay's INDC.

For details on the carbon calculation, please refer to Annex 10 of the prodoc.

Land degradation:

The project intervenes on farms which practice livestock production on degraded and severely degraded land. The current management practices aimed at maximizing herd size increase degradation processes including compaction and erosion. Through the project, this trend will be reversed on 60 farms covering 35,000 ha through measures such as a reduction in herd size while maintaining productivity, introduction of paddocks, improvement pastures through paddocks. This leads to a build up of organic carbon, improvement of soil biodiversity and to a recuperation of degraded areas. Indirectly, 400,000 ha will be targeted on about 700 farms which are participating in the DACC-2 project.

The global environmental benefits will be monitored through the innovative on-farm monitoring system which will be implementaed under the project.

6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

No changes from PIF

Finally, while the main structure of the log-frame was not changed, some outcome-level indicators have been modified to better reflect the measurement of the project outcomes. The changes are summarized in the table below:

Table 1. Summary of changes in project design

Indicator in the approved PIF	Revised indicator	Comment
---	<u>Indicator 1.2:</u> Number of institutions that commit to supporting the implementation of CSLM	The indicator was added to measure the achievement of outcome 1.2 which did not have an associated indicator in the PIF. The means of verification are institutional action plans or programs for mainstreaming CSLM at institutional level; and budget allocation for CSLM activities
---	<u>Indicator 2.3</u> Participating farms with increased farm-level income.	The indicator was added to measure the economic benefits generated at farm level from the implementation of the CSLM strategies. The target will be quantified at project inception.
<u>Indicator 2.4:</u> Volume of investment mobilized and leveraged by this GEF project for low GHG development (disaggregated by private and public investment)	--	The indicator was taken out of the results framework. During the preparation phase, 5 m USD of additional funds could already be ensured co-financing to support implementation of CSLM strategies at farm level (see section A.1.5 on cofinancing above). Furthermore the indicator raised attributional issues.

A.2. Child Project? If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

Not applicable

A.3. Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes /no)? and indigenous peoples (yes /no)?⁹

During Project preparation, multiple consultations have been held with stakeholders and potential partners, including civil society organizations and direct beneficiaries.

The project will work with a wide array of stakeholders, from the local and national level. Primary stakeholders are small and medium livestock farmers and farm workers in the four pilot regions which will strengthen their capacities to implement climate-smart livestock management strategies on their farms. The farmers will help identify the optimal approach to CSLM, including specific practices and technologies. They will also be

⁹ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

involved in the deployment of the farm-level monitoring system. The project will directly target 60 farmers, and others indirectly through the parallel implementation of the DACC-2 project (see component 2). Furthermore, the project targets technical advisors (extensionists), both associated with farmers' organizations and independent who will improve their knowledge and skills to advise farmers on the implementation of climate-smart livestock approaches through the co-innovation approach. 75 extensionists will directly benefit from capacity building activities under the project. Finally, the project targets decision makers and technical staff of public and private institutions in the livestock sector which will improve capacities to develop strategies and projects to mainstream climate-smart approaches into their policies and work programmes at national and institutional levels. The main stakeholders and their roles are listed in Table 2:

Table 2 Project stakeholders.

Stakeholder (group)	Role in project implementation
Public sector	
Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)	
Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall project coordination • Chairs executive committee • Provide technical and logistical support • Contribute to assessing impact of the project; • Benefit from capacity building activities. • Co-financing of project
Office of Programming and Agricultural Policy (OPYPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic guidance for the project • Mainstreaming of CSLM strategy into policy and strategies at national level
Agricultural Sustainability and Climate Change Unit (UASCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical guidance of the project; • Benefit from capacity building
Rural Development Directorate of MGAP (DGDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support at territorial level; • Benefit from capacity building; • Promotion of upscaling and replication;
Directorate for Natural Resources (DGRN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical guidance of the project; in particular with regard to soil and water management • Benefit from capacity building.
Agricultural development councils at Department level (CDA) and at local level (MDR).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for ensuring participatory approach at local level; • Responsible for advertising and rolling out project activities at local level; • Will benefit from capacity building and training.
Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA)	
Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall policy guidance to Project; • Facilitate coordination with all other activities under the global conventions, especially the UNFCCC (e.g. inventories). • Part of project steering committee
Climate Change Division (DCC) of MVOTMA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with other CC initiatives in Uruguay; • Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy • Technical guidance to the MRV and NAMA outputs, to ensure they are in line with UNFCCC expectations and developments.
National Directorate of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with other initiatives on rangelands and

Environment (DINAMA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> grasslands ecosystems and buffer zone management; Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy
Public-private institutions	
The National Institute for Agricultural Research (INIA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific back-up of the project and in the monitoring activities and in the development of the tools for the MRV system Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy Co-financing o project activities Part of Advisory committee (MGCN)
The Institute of Livestock Technology Transfer (IPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific back-up and provision of information Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy Support in rolling out Project activities at local level Will benefit from capacity building and training. Part of advisory committee (MGCN) Co-financing o project activities
National Meat Institute (INAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy Will benefit from capacity building and training.
Uruguayan Wool Secretariat (SUL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy Will benefit from capacity building and training.
Academic institutions	
Faculty of Agronomy (FAGRO) of the University of the Republic (Udelar)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy Major methodological inputs to the design of the farme intervention strategies and the farm-level moitoring system Support of capacity building and training activities Support in rolling out Project activities at local level Part of advisory committee (MGCN)
Farmers' organizations	
Uruguayan Federation of Regional Centres of Agricultural Experimentation (FUCREA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination of farmers; Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy Support in rolling out Project activities at local level Will benefit from capacity building and training. Part of advisory committee (MGCN)
National Commission for Rural Development (CNFR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination of farmers; Participate in development and validation of national CSLM strategy

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in rolling out Project activities at local level • Will benefit from capacity building and training. • Part of advisory committee (MGCN)
Other Farmers Organizations and Farmers Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiaries of capacity building; • Delivery of training and other support to farmers.
Advisory board	
Extended Natural Rangelands Board (MGCN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated by MGAP as Advisory Committee to the project. For roles, see section 3, implementation arrangements
International partners	
FAO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing agency • Provides technical backstopping, advisory services and logistical support • Support to dissemination of project results at regional and global levels • Provides Cofinancing
Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides cofinancing to the establishment of the on-farm monitoring system • Provides technical advice and forum to disseminate project results at international level

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes /no)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes /no)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women X%, men X%)? ¹⁰

Women and men, due to their different economic and social roles and experiences, have differentiated responsibilities and capacities on farms. A review conducted during project preparation with specialists from INIA and IPA concluded that on livestock farms, two types of roles can be observed. The first role is the woman who manages the household, is in charge of the family, and perhaps the garden and small animals, but does not get involved in management decisions on the farms. In the second case, the woman is also involved in the management of the farm, in addition of the activities in the household. In the second case, the role of the women as key agents of change becomes evident. Women who participate in farm-level decisions are more open to innovating processes and adopting new technologies. It can be observed that farms where women participate in management decisions dedicate a larger part of the revenue to productive investments, and less to family consumption, than farms managed only by men. Likewise, younger farmers are generally more open to innovation than older farmers.

Based on this assessment, the project will strengthen the participation of women in the implementation of the project activities, both at local and national levels. Furthermore, special consideration will be given to involve young farmers in the project activities, as they generally are particularly open to innovation.

A gender mainstreaming strategy has been incorporated throughout the project document, and all relevant outputs include gender and social inclusion considerations, including the following:

¹⁰ Same as footnote 8 above.

- Under Output 1.1.1: The gender perspective will be reflected in the policy documents, such as the CSLM strategy, as well as the implementation at institutional level.
- Under Output 2.1.1, 20 % of the selected pilot farms will be female-headed households. In designing and implementing the farm-level CSLM strategies, special emphasis will be taken to ensure the active participation of the woman, including an analysis of the roles and responsibilities and labour required by male and female household members in the implementation of the strategy optimize the participation of women in livestock management and their economic benefit.
- Under Output 2.1.2: In all capacity-building activities of the project, 30 % of the participants will be women. Training activities, workshops and field days will be designed in a way to enable active participation by women.

In line with the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, the GEF-6 approach on gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment, and the FAO Policy on Gender Equality and its Environmental and Social Management Safeguards, gender concerns will be addressed throughout the Project implementation cycle. The M&E system on the project will include gender sensitive indicators its monitoring and evaluation.

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

A full risk analysis following FAO guidance with identification of mitigation actions can be found in Appendix 4 of the PRODOC. A summary of the project's risk analysis is found in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Project risks

Description of risk	Impact	Probability of occurrence ¹¹	Incidence ¹²	Mitigation actions
Extreme events related to climate change and climate variability	Should the Project target areas experience extreme events such as drought during the Project intervention, the uptake of measures may be slower than anticipated due to changing priorities of the participating farmers. Benefits to the farmer may not be visible.	M	M	The selection of sites across the country, in different agro-ecological zones will ensure that at least a good proportion of the farmers are able to introduce and test the technologies and practices, even if drought is experienced in one area. The Co-innovation approach allows adopting the CSLM strategy to unforeseen climatic situations. Investments to cope with unforeseen drought conditions may be covered by the DACC-2 project. The Project management will monitor the situation closely and take remedial action if necessary.
Animal disease epidemic in the project area	Should one or more of the Project target areas experience a disease epidemic, it will make it very difficult to test and develop new technologies	L	MH	The selection of sites across the country, in different agro-ecological zones will ensure that at least a good proportion of the farmers are able to introduce and test the technologies and practices, even if an epidemic is experienced in one area.

¹¹ H: High; MH: Moderately High; ML: Moderately Low; L: Low

¹² H: High; MH: Moderately High; ML: Moderately Low; L: Low

Description of risk	Impact	Probability of occurrence ¹¹	Incidence ¹²	Mitigation actions
	and practices. It may also make the farmers more risk averse, and less willing to participate in the Project.			The only epidemic that could affect the project is Foot and Mouth disease. However, the likelihood of an outbreak is low, as Uruguay has adequate prevention for this disease (i.e. vaccination, border controls). The Project management will monitor the situation closely and take remedial action if necessary.
Lack of interest and motivation by farmers to participate	If there is a lack of interest, development and implementation of the CSLM strategies may be slower than anticipated. In consequence, targets on global environmental benefits may only be partially reached.	L	H	The superior economic profitability of CSLM compared to baseline production system is expected to raise interest among farmers. In the selection process, care will be taken that participating farmers have a genuine interest and motivation. Furthermore, the selection process is articulated with local farmers' associations which will support the roll-out of field activities. The Project will implement proven measures and approaches that ultimately make good economic and financial sense to farmers. This should ensure that over time most farmers wish to participate.
Lack of interest of stakeholders to participate in the CSLM strategy elaboration and validation process and capacity building activities.	The CSLM strategy is not adopted by the institutions.	ML	H	Most potential stakeholders were involved in the preparation phase and support the Project's approach. The Project will be advised by the National Livestock Rangelands Board (MGCN), where all key actors from public, private, academic sectors and civil society participate. This will ensure a fluid information flow and feedback mechanism with all stakeholders.
Carbon sequestered in soils is uncertain.	Carbon sequestration targets can only partially be achieved.	ML	M	The estimations of carbon sequestration on natural rangelands is based on best available and up-to date information. Furthermore, a conservative approach was adopted to estimating soil carbon balance. The on-farm monitoring system will monitor trends in soil and vegetation carbon. On farms where levels deviate from the target, farm-level CSLM strategies will be adjusted. However, confidence is high as the project will eliminate overgrazing which is the main driver of soil degradation and carbon loss.
Rebound effect: It is likely that the project will contribute to increasing the volume of production, given the	GHG emission reduction targets can not be met by the project.	L	M	Overall emissions from the livestock sector can be expressed as the production volume times the average emission per unit of product (Emission intensity – Ei). Within the project area (35,000 ha).

Description of risk	Impact	Probability of occurrence 11	Incidence ¹²	Mitigation actions
financial profitability of CSLM practices. This raises the risk of a potential increase of overall GHG emissions, rather than the expected decrease.				<p>production is estimated to grow by 53% through productivity gains (from 3,100 ton live weight to 4,800), while emission intensity will decrease by 38 % considering gross emissions by livestock only, and by 71 % considering carbon sequestration. This results in a net mitigation effect of livestock production. There will thus be no increase in absolute emissions within the project area.</p> <p>At <u>national level</u>, it may be envisaged that because CSLM practices are more profitable than current practices, the project will contribute to accelerating the growth of the national beef sector, leading to more animals in production. This could result in a rebound effect whereby the decrease in emission intensity is offset by the overall growth in production. However, this scenario must be compared against a baseline in which the beef sector is likely to grow anyway, driven by national and international demand. Global meat consumption is expected to nearly double between 2005 and 2050. Without the project, the sector's growth would take place emission intensity levels close to current ones. It is thus unlikely that any possible rebound effect causes greater absolute emission increases than the "no project" scenario.</p>
Low technical capacity of experts and institutions at national and local level halting the project's progress	The lack of technical capacities may slow down the identification of qualified experts and institutions to implement project activities. It may also slow down progress of project execution.	L	ML	The assessment conducted during the PPG phase shows that this risk is low and suitable national experts can be identified. In terms of institutional capacity, the risk will be mitigated through the project's capacity building activities.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)** will be the GEF Agency responsible for supervision and provision of technical guidance during project implementation. In addition, at the request of the government of Uruguay, FAO will act as financial and operational Executing Agency, and will deliver procurement and contracting services to the project using FAO rules and procedures, as well as financial services to manage GEF resources. Section 3.2.2 of the PRODOC provides a detailed description of FAO's roles and responsibilities in the project governance structure.

In addition to FAO as GEF Implementing Agency, the main institutions involved in the project are the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP) with its Office of Programming and Agricultural Policy (OPYPA) Directorate for Natural Resources (DGRN), Directorate for Rural Development (DGDR), and Unit for Project Management (UGP). Also, the Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment is involved through the National Directorate of Environment (DINAMA). The **Agricultural Sustainability and Climate Change Unit (UASCC)** of OPYPA will be the project implementing partner. UASCC will be responsible for ensuring the overall coordination of the project's implementation, as well as coordination and collaboration with partner institutions, local community organizations and other entities participating in the project, and for managing at the national level the cofinancing agreed during the formulation of the project.

FAO and the implementing partners will collaborate with the implementing agencies of other programs and projects in order to identify opportunities and mechanisms to facilitate synergies with other relevant GEF projects, as well as projects supported by other donors. This collaboration will include: (i) informal communications between GEF agencies and other partners in implementing programs and projects; and (ii) exchange of information and outreach materials between projects.

In Uruguay the project will develop synergies with the following initiatives:

- *Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Climate Change (DACC-2)* This project will be implemented in close coordination with the GEF project and will be an important avenue for replication and scaling up. (see Annex 9)
- *FFEM/GEF(UNDP): Sustainable production and consumption in the protected areas and their adjacent territories.* This project fits into the search of the balance between growth and preservation of natural and cultural heritage, in specific territories, identified for their environmental value and for three sectors having direct impacts on the environment: beef production on natural pasture, eco-tourism and fishing in lagoon. In this regard, the proposed FAO/GEF project will articulate specifically with the activities related to beef production in natural pastures, having significant opportunities for synergies (e.g. in relation to land restoration and replacement of practices that induce degradation of rangelands by good practices). Following Uruguay's institutionality, the coordination between both projects will be conducted by the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA, through the DINAMA) and the MGAP. FAO and UNDP will support this process whenever required, and if such participation adds value to the institutional tasks performed by both ministries. FAO will provide staff time and will periodically request information from the MGAP to duly report this coordination process to the GEF.

At global level, the project will develop mechanisms for collaboration with the following initiatives:

- GEF Project # 5724: *Participatory assessment of land degradation and sustainable land management in grasslands and pastoral systems*
- GEF Project #4775 Ecuador : *Promotion of climate-smart livestock management integrating reversion of land degradation and reduction of desertification risks in vulnerable provinces*

For strategic decisions a Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established, which will consist of representatives of MGAP, MVOTMA and FAO. Its main function is to guide the implementation of the project, check and approve the annual work plans, approve the financial and technical reports, and provide strategic guidance to project implementation (section 3.2.3 describes features of the PSC).

MGAP will designate a National Project Director (NPD). The NPD will be a senior MGAP staff and will have the responsibility of supervising and guiding the Project Coordinator on the government policies and priorities. He/she will also be responsible for coordinating the activities with all the national bodies related to the different project components, as well as with the project partners. He/she will be responsible for requesting FAO the timely disbursement of GEF resources that will allow the execution of project activities, in strict accordance with the Project Results-Based Budget and the approved AWP/B for the current project year.

A GEF-financed Project Team (PT) will be established. The main responsibility of the PT, following the directives and decisions of the Project Steering Committee and under the supervision of the NPD, is to ensure coordination and execution of the project through the rigorous and effective implementation of the AWP/B.

Under the supervision of the NPD, the PT will be headed by a full-time Project Coordinator (PC) (financed by GEF funds) who will be in charge of project daily management and technical supervision including: i) coordinate and closely supervise the implementation of project activities; ii) day-to-day project management; iii) coordination with related initiatives; iv) ensuring collaboration between the participating national, provincial and local institutions and organizations; v) implement and manage the project M&E plan and its communication program; vi) prepare the Project Progress Reports (PPRs), containing information on the activities carried out and the progress in the achievement of outcomes and outputs; vii) organize annual project workshops and meetings to monitor project progress and will prepare the Annual Work Plans and Budgets (AWP/B); viii) submit PPRs together with the AWP/B to the Project Management Committee (PMC) for approval and presentation to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and FAO; ix) act as secretary to the PMC and PSC; x) supporting the preparation of PIRs, mid-term and final evaluations.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The proposed project builds on experiences of the project “Co-innovation in family livestock systems in Eastern Uruguay” implemented by INIA, FAGRO, UDELAR and the University of Wageningen between 2012 and 2014. The project aimed at improving the economic situation of family farmers and the natural resources by analysing and redesigning the production systems without external financial support for investments, based on the co-innovation approach, and applying process technologies for herd and grassland management. (see section 1.3.1 and annex 8 of the prodoc). On average, stocking rates were reduced by 8%. Farm records showed that most farms could improve the quantity of fodder (+40%), which improved key production parameters such as weight of the calves at weaning (+20%), and meat production (+24%), resulting in increased net income. The costs of these practices are very low (less than 5 USD/cow/year). The interventions reportedly yielded improvements of the production and income levels from the first year on. Furthermore, the farms reported a decrease in work load, indicating a higher productivity and quality of life.

According to the cost benefit analysis carried out during project preparation, the adoption of CSL management practices is highly profitable. Estimated IRR of adoption range between 19.3 and 39.9%. The details of these results are presented in Annex 8 of the project document.

These benefits provide an incentive to farmers to manage their rangelands sustainably. the pressure on grasslands is reduced, and degradation processes on grasslands are reversed. Due to the restructuring of the herd, GHG emissions will be reduced considerably. It will improve the competitiveness of livestock farmers vis-à-vis agriculture and forestry which have important environmental impacts. At national level, a background study conducted during the PPG phase suggests the application of the CSLM approach could lead to the disappearance of 600,000 non-productive cows compared to a business-as-usual scenario, with considerable economic and environmental benefits.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

A communication strategy will be developed and implemented to ensure fluid information flow with farmers, extensionists and institutional partners, in support to the activities under Component 1 (strategy and NAMA development processes) and Component 2 (implementation of farm-level strategies, field days). The strategy will ensure that information on project results and lessons are disseminated to a wide audience through appropriate communication channels. Activities include the preparation of communications materials such as posters and leaflets, presence in local media (TV, AM radio, newspapers), as well as the set-up and maintenance of a project website and dedicated social media accounts over the whole project period. FAO will fund a communications specialist to support implementation of the communications and outreach strategy.

At regional and global levels, the project will support publication of at least three journal articles on project results, particularly with regard to novel approaches to on-farm GHG monitoring and implementation of CSLM strategies. Project results will be presented at two international conferences related to Climate-Smart Agriculture. Furthermore, the project will facilitate the participation of project staff in three events of international research and practitioners' networks. A webinar series on CSLM through a regional partnership of the networks to connect with peers from other countries in the region. FAO through its Livestock Unit will work to disseminate project results and lessons through GLEAM, LEAP, and other CSA livestock related initiatives. Dissemination at global level will also be ensured through co-operation with the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, a co-financing partner.

FAO and GEF logos will be used, along with government logo, in all knowledge products and in any communication materials developed (such as posters, pamphlets etc.).

- B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

Climate Change Mitigation: The project is consistent with Uruguay's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the UNFCCC submitted in 2015. According to the INDC the country intends to reduce with domestic resources the emission intensity of beef production by 33% (CH₄) and 31 % (N₂O) per kilogram of beef by 2030. With additional means of implementation, the reduction of emission intensity in this sector could be increased to 46 % (CH₄) and 41 % (N₂O). The proposed project would not only contribute to the reduction of emission intensity in the livestock sector, but also improve carbon sequestration in degraded rangelands, which is considered an important contribution to CO₂ removal ,

In 2016 the SNRCC submitted Uruguay's Fourth National Communication (FNC) to the UNFCCC. The FNC acknowledges the National Climate Change Policy (PNCC) that is currently developed in order to strengthen Uruguay's structural transformation until 2050. The PNCC covers different sectors and seeks to include climate change related topics into public policies, especially development policies including the agriculture and livestock sectors.

Uruguay's Third National Communication (TNC) to the UNFCCC validates the priorities established in the PNRCC. The TNC specifically promotes climate change mitigation actions related to land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) and agriculture. It recognizes that the agricultural sector is the biggest emitter of direct GHGs in Uruguay, representing more than 80% of total emissions, followed by energy. In particular, grazing cattle explains as much as 76% of all the emissions of Uruguay. The TNC identifies livestock as key sources of CO₂ emissions. The TNC notably identifies the following strategies for climate change mitigation: (i) increasing carbon sequestration in rangeland; and (ii) reducing methane emissions from enteric fermentation. Both strategies are supported through the GEF Project.

Land Degradation: Uruguay submitted its second national report to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) in 2002 and finalized its National Action Plan in 2004. This Project is in line with the priorities established in these documents. The results will provide important inputs to shape the soil conservation policies on natural rangelands. Since 2012, MGAP has put in place a policy that requires farmers planting more than 50 ha of crops to present a medium term soil use and management plan that aims at minimizing erosion measured through the Universal Soil Losses Equation. MGAP is dedicated to expand conservation policies to rangelands, mainly through the promotion of good practices of rangeland management that, among other co-benefits, avoid naked soils and sward degradation. These actions are aligned with UNCCD.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities are summarized in Table 3 below. M&E activities will be undertaken through: (i) day-to-day monitoring and project progress supervision missions (PMU); (ii) technical monitoring of indicators to measure a reduction in land degradation (PMU and LTU in coordination with partners); (iii) mid-term review and final evaluation (independent consultants and FAO Evaluation Office); and (v) monitoring and supervision missions (FAO). Project M&E activities are estimated at USD 177,776. For further details kindly refer to Section 3.5 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
Inception workshop	NPC; FAO Uruguay (with support from the LTO, and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 1,000
Project Inception report	NPC, M&E expert and FAO Uruguay with clearance by the LTO, BH and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	-
Project level impact monitoring	NPC; project partners, local organizations	Continuous	USD 53,007 (5 % project coordinator+25 % Assistant coordinator)
Field level impact monitoring	Field coordinator, technicians	Continuous	USD 36,125 (3 % Field Coordinator, 3 % Technicians, 5 % Farm-level monitoring system)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	PC; FAO (FAO Uruguay, LTO). FAO-GEF Coordination Unit may participate in the visits if needed.	Annual, or as needed	FAO visits will be borne by GEF agency fees
			Project Coordination visits shall be borne by the project's travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPRs)	PC, with stakeholder contributions and other participating institutions	Six-monthly	USD 8628 (3.5% of the Project Coordinator's time)
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	Drafted by the NPC, with the supervision of the LTO and BH. Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	FAO staff time financed through GEF agency fees. PCU time covered by the project budget.
Co-financing reports	PC with input from other co-financiers	Annual	USD 2465 (1% of the Coordinator's time)
Technical reports	PC, FAO (LTO, FAO Uruguay)	As needed	

Mid-term review	FAO Uruguay, External consultant, in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	Midway through the project implementation period	USD 20,000 by an external consultancy
Final evaluation	External consultant, FAO Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	At the end of the project	USD 50,000 by an external consultancy. FAO staff time and travel costs will be financed by GEF agency fees.
Terminal Report	PC; FAO (FAO Uruguay, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, TCS Reporting Unit)	Two months prior to the end of the project.	USD 6,550
Total budget			USD 177,776

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies¹³ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Alexander Jones, Director, Climate and Environment Division FAO Rome		10 April 2018	Pierre Gerber Senior Policy Officer	+1 202 243 8281	<u>Pierre.gerber@fao.org</u> ; <u>Christine.ellefson@fao.org</u>
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, GEF Unit, Climate and Environment Division					

¹³ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
Project Objective: To mitigate climate change and to restore degraded lands through the promotion of climate-smart practices in the livestock sector, with focus in family farming.							
Component 1: Strengthening the institutional framework and national capacities to implement the climate smart livestock management (CSLM)							
Outcome 1.1: Policy and planning frameworks have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation and national communication on livestock emissions.	Indicator 3 (CC): One MRV system for emission reduction in place and reporting verified data for the large ruminant livestock sub-sector, as part of the NAMA development	4		8	MRV documentation; reports of national information system on GHG emissions		M+E Expert
	Indicator 5 (CC): Degree of support for low GHG development in the policy planning and regulatory framework.	3		6	Strategy document; policies and work plans of key institutions	Adequate budget allocation by government	M+E Expert
Output 1.1.1: A national climate-smart livestock management (CSLM) strategy, designed and validated with key stakeholders.	Indicator 1.1.1a: A CSLM strategy document;	Lack of CSLM strategy	1 draft strategy elaborated and validated	1 finalized CSLM strategy presented to the Government and disseminated at regional and local level	CSLM strategy document	Willingness and capacities of the institutions to participate and contribute to the preparation and validation of the CSLM strategy; Agreement on	M+E Expert

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
						common criteria for CSLM can be reached among stakeholders	
	Indicator 1.1.1b: Number of institutions involved in the preparation and validation process		10 institutions involved in the preparation and validation process	10 institutions involved in the preparation and validation process	Documentation of validation workshops	Willingness and capacities of the institutions to participate and contribute to the preparation and validation of the CSLM strategy	<i>M+E Expert</i>
Output 1.1.2: A Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action (NAMA), including a national measuring, reporting and validation (MRV) system for the livestock ruminant sector.	Indicator 1.1.2a: A validated NAMA document and MRV system	Lack of NAMA and MRV system	1 MRV system proposed	1 validated NAMA and 1 MRV system presented to the Government	NAMA document and MRV system;		<i>M+E Expert</i>
	Indicator 1.1.2b: Number of institutions involved in the validation of the NAMA			10 institutions involved in the validation of the NAMA	Documentation of validation workshops	Willingness and capacities of the institutions to participate and contribute to validation of the NAMA	<i>M+E Expert</i>
Outcome 1.2: National capacities have been strengthened to support CSLM implementation.	Indicator 1.2: No. of institutions that commit to supporting the implementation of CSLM;	0 organizations		6 national organizations with confirmed commitment to CSLM implementation	Action plans or institutional programs for mainstreaming CSLM at institutional level; budget allocation for CSLM	Willingness of the institutions to mainstream CSLM at institutional level and allocate budget	<i>M+E Expert</i>

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
Output 1.2.1: Capacities developed to effectively support the implementation of CSLM with a gender-sensitive perspective.	Indicator 1.2.1: Number of staff in national institutions with enhanced capacities for mainstreaming CSLM at institutional level	0 staff members		30 staff members from 6 institutions with enhanced capacities for mainstreaming CSLM at institutional level	Workshop documentation and participants' evaluation	Willingness of the institutions to assign staff to participate in capacity building measures	<i>M+E Expert</i>
Output 1.2.2: A training program in place, to supporting the rolling out of improved and climate-smart approaches to livestock management.	Indicator 1.2.2: Number of extensionists with enhanced knowledge and capacities on CSLM	0 extensionists	75 extensionists with improved knowledge and capacities on CSLM	75 extensionists with improved knowledge and capacities on CSLM	Final evaluation of the CSLM training courses	Willingness and availability of the extensionists to participate in the training courses	<i>M+E Expert</i>
Component 2: Development and deployment of CSLM technologies and practices at field level.							
Outcome 2.1 Sustainable climate-smart livestock management (CSLM) has been implemented in degraded/degrading lands.	Indicator LD 1.1: Land area under effective rangeland management practices and/or supporting climate-smart agriculture.	35,000 ha under CSLM	15,000 ha under CSLM	35,000 ha under CSLM.	GIS established in the on-farm monitoring system; documentation of farming practices of farmers and extensionists.	Willingness of farmers to participate and share correct information on farming practices; no occurrence of extreme climatic events during the implementation phase of the project; stability of economic framework conditions for the farmers.	Component 2 coordinator

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
	Indicator 1 (CC): Tons of CO2eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly and indirectly.			379,000 t CO2eq of GHG reduced or avoided directly and indirectly.	Analysis of GHG emissions in the farm-level monitoring system.	Willingness of farmers to participate and share correct information on farming practices; no occurrence of extreme climatic events during the implementation phase of the project; stability of economic framework conditions for the farmers.	Implementing institution of the monitoring system
	Participating farms with increased farm-level incomes of at least % per year. ¹⁴			At least 80 % of participating farms achieve a minimum of % increase of farm-level incomes.	Financial reports of participating farms.		Component 2 coordinator
	Indicator 4 (CC): Area under low GHG technologies and practices.			Additional 35,000 has under low GHG (CSLM) management practices.	GIS established in the on-farm monitoring system; documentation of farming practices of farmers and extensionists.	Willingness of farmers to participate and share correct information on farming practices; no occurrence of extreme climatic events during the implementation phase of the project; stability of economic framework conditions for the farmers.	Component 2 coordinator

¹⁴ Target will be quantified at inception
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
Output 2.1.1: Short and medium-term farm level strategies implemented on project farms with a gender perspective.	Indicator 2.1.1: Number of CSLM strategies implemented with a co-innovation process on farm level.		60 focus farms selected and co-innovation process for the implementation of CSLM strategies initiated, at least 20 % women-headed.	60 farms implemented CSLM strategies and apply improved practices and technologies.	Documentation of CLSM farming practices of farmers and extensionists.	Willingness of farmers to participate and share correct information on farming practices; no occurrence of extreme climatic events during the implementation phase of the project; stability of economic framework conditions for the farmers.	Component 2 coordinator
Output 2.1.2: A capacity development program focused on the application of the CSLM technologies and practices.	Indicator 2.1.2: Number of farmers with enhanced knowledge and capacities on CSLM.		120 farmers and farm employees, trained at least 30 % female participants.	120 farmers and farm employees, trained at least 30 % female participants.	Final evaluation of the workshops and field days.	Willingness and availability of the farmers to participate in the workshops and field days.	Component 2 coordinator
Output 2.1.3: On-farm monitoring system, in place to monitor GHG emissions, adaptation strategies, financing, land degradation and biodiversity.	Indicator 2.1.3: Number of farms that are integrated into the monitoring system.		GIS established and monitoring of 60 farms in progress.	Monitoring of 60 farms over 4 years;	GIS for focus farms; protocols for sampling and analysis in the monitoring system; reports on the monitoring system.	Available capacity of laboratories to analyse samples and process data; willingness of farmers to share correct information.	Implementing institution of the monitoring system
Component 3: 3. Monitoring, evaluation and knowledge-sharing							
Outcome 3.1: Project implementation based on RBM and lessons	M&E system ensuring timely delivery of project benefits and		up-to-date monitoring on outcomes, outputs	up-to-date monitoring on outcomes, outputs	Project progress and evaluation		M&E Expert

GEF6 CEO Endorsement / Approval Template-August2016

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
learned/good practices documented and disseminated	adaptive results-based management.		and activities.	and activities.	reports.		
Output 3.1.1: A set of manuals and media products that describe the improved CSLM practices, and number of measures and technologies, for use by extension workers and farmers.	Indicator 3.1.1: Number of information products distributed copies.		To be determined at project inception.	To be determined at project inception.	Types information material produced; records of the distribution of copies; number of views in social media.		M&E Expert
Output 3.1.2: Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and system, in place.	Indicator 3.1.2: Number of meetings and workshops.		Regular meetings of the coordinating bodies; regular reporting on the progress and results of the project.	Regular meetings of the coordinating bodies; regular reporting on the progress and results of the project.	Documentation of regular meetings; project reports.		M&E Expert
Output 3.1.3: Knowledge-sharing with other countries and dissemination of verifiable data and tested methodologies	Indicator 3.1.3a: Number of publications. Indicator 3.1.3b: Number of presentations at conferences. Indicator 3.1.3c: Participation in networking events.		To be determined at project inception.	Publication of 3 journal articles.	Journal articles		M&E Expert
			To be determined at project inception.	Presentation of the project at 2 conferences.	Conference proceedings.		M&E Expert
			To be determined at project inception.	To be determined at project inception.			M&E Expert

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
Output 3.1.4: Project Mid-term review and Final Evaluation.	Indicator 3.1.4: Number of evaluations conducted		Mid-term review	Final evaluation	Evaluation reports		M&E Expert
Output 3.1.5: A Communication Strategy, implemented.	Indicator 3.1.5: Number of appearance in local media; number of visitors of website and social media accounts		To be determined at project inception	To be determined at project inception	Articles in local media; number of TV appearances; statistics of website and social media		M&E Expert

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

STAP Comments	Response
<p>1. STAP welcomes this proposal to develop climate-smart strategies and practices to the livestock production sector in Uruguay. As noted in the PIF, there are considerable barriers to achieving real change in livestock management especially in the context of 'small' (by Uruguayan standards) farms. Therefore, there is a critical need to indicate in the proposal how these barriers will be tackled and how 'climate-smart livestock management (CLSM)' can progress from rhetoric to tangible reality. The current PIF shies away from identifying the action pathways from the current baseline to a technologically-enhanced set of practices that deliver multiple benefits both to the global environment and to human development. This careful linking of actions to outputs, and outputs to outcomes must be the main focus of the proposal as it is further developed.</p>	<p>The identification of barriers and design of activities the project will put in place to overcome them has been improved during project proposal. Barriers and how they will be tackled are described in section 1.2.3 of the project document. They are linked to the results chain as follows:</p> <p>At farm level, the perceived risk of new technologies, a lack of knowledge of the farmers of low-cost alternatives to optimize their production system, have been identified as main barriers to adoption of the CSLM approach. These barriers will be systematically addressed by the project through (i) an integrated system of knowledge transfer combining individual technical assistance to farms by extensionists with workshops and field days to enable farmer-to-farmer extension; (ii) a monitoring system which gives evidence of the socioeconomic and environmental benefits achieved. The extension strategy follows the co-innovation approach. Under this approach, the extensionist designs a management strategy with the farmer, based on a careful analysis of the production system, environmental and socio-economic goals of the farmer and his/her family. The approach which has been successfully tested on small and medium livestock farms in Uruguay to provide both economic returns and global environmental benefits in 1-3 years. The field activities are coordinated with other technical programmes for the livestock sector and complemented by a training programme for private extensionists to ensure broad replicability and scaling up.</p> <p>At national level, the main barriers identified concern a lack of a common strategy to CSLM among key actors, and a lack of incentives to farmers including long-term technical assistance. These barriers will be tackled through the development of a national CSLM strategy with the involvement of public and private sector institutions, including farmers' organizations, civil society as well as academic and research institutions. The CSLM strategy will define a common action framework based on agreed principles to integrate climate-smart practices, including the development of incentives, along the entire beef value chain. Through the project, institutions will build capacities to integrate the CSLM strategy into their policies and programmes. The CSLM strategy will be complemented by development of the NAMA and MRV for the beef sector. This will provide</p>

	<p>opportunities to identify public and private sources of co-financing for the implementation of the strategy, including incentives and technical assistance.</p>
<p>2. Articulation of CSLM as a goal. STAP is somewhat perplexed - especially in the context of FAO's championing of the approach - that in this proposal there is no clear definition of what is actually meant by climate-smart livestock management and what broad goals it is intended to achieve. CSLM could be broadly defined as "livestock management that sustainably increases productivity, resilience (adaptation), reduces/removes greenhouse gases (mitigation), and enhances achievement of national food security and development goals." [Adapted from FAO sources].</p>	<p>The project adopts a definition of CSLM based on the FAO Sourcebook on Climate Smart Agriculture. CSLM is based on two basic principles: (i) increased efficiency in the use of resources, and (ii) increased resilience and risk management at farm and systemic levels. Through the application of these principles, CSLM contributes to improved productivity and climate change mitigation; as well as to national food security and broader development goals.</p> <p>Section 1.3.1 of the project document and Annex 8 give examples of measures that will be implemented under the project using the co-innovation approach.</p>
<p>3. To support point 2 above, STAP suggests that even at this PIF/PPG stage, the CSLM strategy is given some substance in order to guide the design of the project and to prevent the project reverting to a top-down technology introduction proposal. STAP would like to see:</p> <p>a. A focus on improving livelihoods and income so that there is incentive for smallholder farmers to invest in climate-smart livestock management. It is imperative that any improved technologies for CSLM have a solid evidence-base to show that they bring positive returns to small farmers under real-life farming conditions. STAP notes with some concern that the PIF assumes there will be no increase in production consequent on CSLM (see Table 1 with/without project scenarios). If this is true then the CSLM approach must reduce production costs for it to be viable for small farmers. These issues should be prominent in the proposal.</p> <p>b. Combining practices that deliver short-term benefits with those that give longer-term benefits may help reduce opportunity costs and provide greater incentives to invest in better management practices. Time horizon issues need to be explicit, especially as most climate-smart agricultural practices incur establishment and</p>	<p>3a: The proposed project builds on experiences of the project "Co-innovation in family livestock systems in Eastern" implemented by INIA, FAGRO, UDELAR and the University of Wageningen between 2012 and 2014. Through this bottom-up approach, the project aimed at improving the economic situation of family farmers and the natural resources by analysing and redesigning the production systems without external financial support for investments, and applying process technologies for herd and grassland management. (see comment 1 and section 1.3.1 of the prodoc).</p> <p>Annex 8 of the project document provides a detailed description of CSLM principles, basic practices and economic benefits.</p> <p>According to the cost benefit analysis carried out during project preparation, the adoption of CSL management practices is highly profitable. Estimated IRR of adoption range between 19.3 and 39.9%. The details of these results are presented in Annex 8 of the project document.</p> <p>3b: Further to the process technologies which will be promoted and which yield short-term benefits (see 3a above), the project will introduce practices which have longer-term benefits both in economic and environmental terms, particularly with regard to carbon sequestration, and require additional investment. These include the establishment of shade and shelter forests, fencing for improved paddock management, and improvement of water sources. To facilitate the adoption of these practices,</p>

<p>maintenance costs. It can take considerable time before farmers benefit from them.</p> <p>c. Access to markets and capital are key constraints for resource-poor farmers, and limit their ability to innovate and raise their income. This requires development plans with appropriate institutions at national to local levels, provision of infrastructure, access to information and training and stakeholder participation as well as security of tenure arrangements.</p> <p>d. Resilience issues need to be included as part of the CSLM strategy. In comparable projects in other countries, a focus on the value-chain to ensure profitable outlets for livestock sales has been one way of promoting resilience. Resilience needs to be explicitly addressed as part of the CSLM Strategy. It should be noted that introduction of improved technologies can lead to loss of resilience, making farmers more vulnerable to external shocks and the risks listed in the PIF.</p>	<p>participating farmers can apply for co-financing through the DACC-2 project, which will be implemented in close cooperation with the GEF project (see Annex 9 for details of the cooperation arrangement).</p> <p>3c: Under PPG, a consultant was hired to specifically look into these issues. At national level, the project will carry-out activities to improve access of CSLM products to international markets. It also includes capacity building of institutions along the beef value chain to mainstream the CSLM strategy into policies and programs, as well as capacity building of extensionists in CSLM practices. A wide stakeholder participation both at national level and field level will be ensured through the involvement of the extended National Livestock Grassland Board (MGCN), which is composed of the main public and private sector institutions, as well as representatives from civil society, academia and farmers' organization. A Monitoring Reporting and Verification system will be designed as part of the NAMA preparation, which will allow to track and report on the environmental performance of the beef sector.</p> <p>3d: Resilience is a basic principle of the CSLM definition adopted by the project. The gains in productivity and income which can be expected through the implementation of farm-level CSLM strategies will strengthen farmers' resilience to climatic and economic shocks. Furthermore, improvements in soil and vegetation condition, as well as developed capacities in the management of rangelands will strengthen resilience to climatic events.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project will adopt a co-innovation approach which bases the introduction of new technologies on a careful analysis of the production system on each farm, and takes into account the economic and technical capacities as well as the goals of the farmer and his/her family. In addition, the approach involves a continuous dialogue with technicians and peers, to allow for progressive adoption.</p> <p>The national CSLM strategy includes resilience as one of the main pillars. The project will support stakeholders in developing options to strengthen resilience to economic or climatic shocks for example through studying options to improve market access for CSLM products.</p>
<p>4. CSLM Practices. STAP appreciates that at the PIF stage, CSLM practices can only be broadly identified. However, the proponents do</p>	<p>Annex 8 provides a complete overview of CSLM approaches practices which will be promoted under the project. They can be grouped in strategic technologies, decision support technologies</p>

<p>need to develop a thorough check-list of technologies, both old and new, that have potential and that could be tested against criteria for delivery of global environmental and development benefits. Climate-smart livestock management practices will certainly include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved feeding strategies (e.g. cut 'n carry) • Rotational grazing • Fodder crops • Grassland restoration and conservation • Manure treatment • Improved livestock health • Animal husbandry improvements. <p>These should be translated into practices suitable for the local ecologies and societies, and be subject to livelihood support and cost-benefit analysis.</p>	<p>and tactical technologies. The farm-level CSLM techniques and practices will be designed through the co-innovation approach in order to fit the individual socio-economic and agro-ecological conditions and goals of farmers and their families.</p> <p>The practices have been selected based on recent successful experiences with the co-innovation approach in Uruguay. Since they are process technologies which work as a system, and since their selection and combination will vary from farm to farm, it is not possible to evaluate individual development and environmental benefits of each technology. However, a financial analysis was carried out for some typical cases and showed a high IRR.</p> <p>The farm-level monitoring system will provide evidence of the developmental and environmental benefits resulting from the implementation of the farm-level CSLM strategies.</p> <p>The experience of the project will be compiled in a CSLM manual which will provide reference for future programmes on sustainable livestock. Together with the capacity building activities for extensionists, and the strengthened capacities of farmers' organizations, this forms the solid groundwork laid out by the project to mainstream CSLM into family livestock farming in Uruguay.</p>
---	--

GEFSEC Comments to be addressed at CEO Endorsement	Response
<p>5a) Please describe specifically how CSLM contributes to Climate Change mitigation.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, there is not enough proven data on the impact of CSLM on reduction of GHG emissions, especially for the Uruguayan context. In addition, the rebound effect from increased productivity, the potential of some practices unintentionally resulting in higher GHG emissions, and the uncertainties surrounding carbon sequestration and MRV if carbon stocks and potential reversibility of stored carbon are a real concern.</p> <p>Since this is a relatively novel area for CCM and a national priority for Uruguay, and other</p>	<p>During project preparation, the GHG emissions reduction estimates were thoroughly revised, based on specific information. Section 1.3.4 and Appendix 11 of the prodoc explain the assumptions and methodologies to estimate GHG emissions reductions resulting from the application of CSLM. Annex 8 provides further references on the mitigation effect of the proposed practices.</p> <p>The scaling up strategy was also developed further. Through a coordination arrangement with the World Bank funded DACC project (BIRF-8099-UY), direct knowledge transfer on CSLM can be ensured to about 700 farmers managing about 400,000 ha of rangelands who participate in the DACC project implemented in parallel to the GEF project. Adding to that is the direct involvement of local farmers' associations, as well as their federations at national level. Further opportunities for scaling up</p>

<p>countries could benefit from on-the-ground, verifiable data from a pilot project such as this, we suggest the project to have a stronger focus on Component 3.</p> <p>In addition, we suggest that the project use the PPG as an opportunity to better understand the emissions profile of small and medium farmers in Uruguay, revise the GHG emissions reduction estimate with more information on baseline emissions, initial conditions of the grasslands, and GHG accounting on practices that will be implemented specific to the Uruguayan context, and develop further the scale up strategy beyond the 60 pilot farms.</p>	<p>will be through the Government's planned National Programme of Technology Transfer and Diffusion. For further detail please refer to section 4.6 (replication and scale-up) and annex 9 (cooperation between DACC and GEF projects) in the prodoc.</p> <p>The rebound effect is discussed in Appendix 4 (risk matrix). Within the project area no increase in absolute emissions within the project area can be expected in spite of a 53 % growth in production. At national level, it is also unlikely that rebound effect causes greater absolute emission increases than the "no project" scenario. This is because carbon sequestration is the dominant GHG mitigation process.</p> <p>The important demonstration effect of this project is fully recognised. Substantial effort will thus be placed on monitoring and evaluation: recruitment of an M&E expert on the Project Team, data collection ensured through the numerous technicians, and letter of agreement with a research organisation including a PhD grant dedicated to monitoring and analysing project results.</p> <p>Dissemination at regional and global level will be ensured through Component 3 with support from FAO through global networks and communities of practice such as through the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock (GASL), the Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) Partnership and the Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA). Also, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition is on board as a co-financing partner and will disseminate project results through its network. At regional level, a webinar series is planned. Finally, the project will facilitate the publication of scientific articles and the participation of project staff in international conferences and networking events related to CSA:</p>
<p>5.b) Under component 2 provide an output for the actual implementation of CSLM technologies and practices.</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1. specifically deals with the implementation of CSLM strategies on 60 pilot farms based on the co-innovation approach.</p>
<p>5.b2) Since the risk of extreme drought in the project target areas is a concern, please comment on how the project can build upon the climate change adaptation project funded by the Adaptation Fund and how CSLM provides added resilience to drought conditions.</p>	<p>The interventions will improve the state of degraded rangelands, revert and prevent soil compaction, and improve vegetation cover. Furthermore, due to the restructuring of the herd and improved availability of forage, animals will be healthier and be able to resist drought better than under a no project scenario. These interventions form part of the CSLM strategy. They have been tested in other projects, notably the GFCC project funded by the AF. Through cooperation with the DACC-2 project, farms can access co-financing for investments in improved water</p>

	<p>sources.</p> <p>It is also anticipated that producers' access to better weather forecast and results from biomass productivity models will contribute to improving their capacity to anticipate and prepare for drought.</p>
<p>5.c) Please provide more information on how the CSLM practices will be scaled up beyond the 60 direct project beneficiaries, especially if the NAMA is not funded. How will the project address the barriers stated in p.10 of the PIF for other farmers once CSLM is proven without the need for outside funding?</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 5.a regarding the scaling up strategy, as well as section 4.3 and Annex 9 of the prodoc.</p>
<p>5.d) Please explain what the low sequestration and high sequestration scenarios depend on. Please ensure that by CEO Endorsement these estimates are revised.</p>	<p>During project preparation, the GHG emissions reduction estimates were thoroughly revised based on new publications and more specific information regarding project areas. Section 1.3.4 and Appendix 11 of the prodoc explain the assumptions and methodologies to estimate GHG emissions reductions resulting from the application of CSLM.</p>
<p>5.e) Please provide a sustainability strategy for the conservation of restored degraded rangelands.</p>	<p>At local level, based on experience with the implementation of the CSLM practices promoted under the project (see response to STAP comments 1 and 3a above), it can be expected that farmers perceive socio-economic as well as environmental benefits, which provide an incentive to continue with the practices in the long term. At national level, the CSLM strategy will provide a long-term vision shared by key actors to conserve rangelands to sequester carbon and provide other ecosystem services such as biodiversity conservation or water regulation and identify concrete policy and programmatic approaches to put this vision into practice. Uruguay has been at the forefront of implementing an innovative soil conservation policy on agricultural lands and for dairy farms (see section on Legal and political framework in the prodoc), and the government has plans to extend this policy to livestock production on natural rangelands. This approach will certainly be strengthened under the project.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁵

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Chiara

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 100,000 - FAO project GCP/URU/035/GFF - "Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands (PPG)"			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Total	USD 100,000	USD 84,394	USD 15,606
Salaries Professional	USD 4,762	USD 0	USD 4,762
Finance & Administration Specialist	USD 4,762	USD 0	USD 4,762
Consultants	USD 84,800	USD 57,383	USD 10,641
GEF Project Design Specialist	USD 23,000	USD 12,623	USD 10,641
National Coordinator	USD 22,800	USD 23,666	USD 0
International Markets and Economics Analyst	USD 6,000	USD 6,228	USD 0
M&E Specialist	USD 3,600	USD 3,737	USD 0
NAMAs Specialist	USD 5,400	USD 5,605	USD 0
Translator	USD 6,000	USD 5,524	USD 0
Production Systems and Technologies Assistant (*)	USD 7,200	USD 0	USD 0
Social and Environmental Risks Analyst (*)	USD 6,000	USD 0	USD 0
Carbon Cycle Specialist (*)	USD 4,800	USD 0	USD 0
Contracts	USD 0	USD 18,000	USD 0
Letter of Agreement with the Faculty of Agronomic Sciences, substituting consultants marked with (*)	USD 0	USD 18,000	USD 0
Travel	USD 6,400	USD 7,064	USD 0
Training	USD 4,038	USD 1,909	USD 203
General Operating Expenses	USD 0	USD 38	USD 0

¹⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

Not applicable

