



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

GEF ID:	<b>4998</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Uruguay</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Environmental Sound Life-Cycle Management of Mercury Containing Products and their Wastes</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5084 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CHEM-3; Others;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$35,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,237,800</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,947,760</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$4,220,560</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>June 14, 2012</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Anil Sookdeo</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Dr. Suely Carvalho</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.	Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP has comparative advantage.	Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes	Yes
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

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

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Yes
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes it aligns with Chem 3.	Yes
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes	Yes
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, Uruguay is supporting the INC process and is formulating a General National Waste Law that will include Mercury.	Yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, there is sustainability and lessons learned component built into the project. This project will also inform the INC.	Yes
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, baseline is clear and well defined.	Yes
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve		The work of the GEF in mercury is insufficient to determine the cost effectiveness of the project however it compares to similar projects that address these issues for POPs. This

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	similar benefits?		project will help in elaborating the costs of the activities as they relate to mercury.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, the project is based on incremental reasoning. It expands on baseline activities where GEF funding is complimentary.	Yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes the framework is sound.	Yes
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, incremental benefit are clear. The project will result in a 20% Hg release reduction from healthcare facilities, 30% reduction from dental practices, 30% reduction from lighting sources, and 10% reduction from products with intentional use. Baseline and benefits will be better defined during PPG stage.	Yes
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	a) Yes, gender dimensions are considered and will be elaborated during PPG.  b) Women frequently work in the healthcare system, so including them will support overall project benefits.	Yes
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, public participation and CSOs roles are identified.	Yes
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes, risks and mitigation measures are identified.	Yes
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the	Yes, the project builds on existing mercury initiatives in the country including new regulations and	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	region?	inventories, and supports the INC process.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, Ministry of Housing, Land Use Planning, and Environment will be the executing agency. Ministry of Public Health will also be involved.	Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>Yes. "During the PPG phase the detailed analysis of the project activities showed that additional resources would be needed to ensure the project would be able to meet its objectives. The driving force behind this is the agreement of the Minamata Convention which prompted suppliers of decontamination technology to impose price increases due to the expected increased demand for this type of equipment. The equipment that is planned to be installed in Uruguay would need to be capable of at least ten years of operation which places it at the higher end of the price scale."</p> <p>This justification is sufficient to recommend the increase.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	PMC is 9% which is acceptable for an MSP. PMC co-financing is 1:2.8 which equals the over all project co-financing ratio.	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Co-financing is a 1:2.8 ratio which is lower than typical POPs projects.  Project budget is too high and should not exceed \$600,000. All components should be reduced to achieve a lower budget. Revised budget may be as follows:  Component 1: \$30,000 Component 2: \$140,000 Component 3: \$300,000 Component 4: \$90,000 Component 5: \$40,000  ES, June 13, 2012: The budget has been reduced from \$930,000 to \$700,000. - Comment cleared	Yes
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is a mix of cash and in-kind. At PIF stage \$600,000 cash is indicated.	Yes
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP will bring \$175,000 in-kind co-financing.	Yes
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		N/A for mercury
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	none received	N/A
	• Convention Secretariat?	none received	N/A
	• Council comments?		N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	none received	N/A
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this time, budget needs to be reduced.  ES, June 13, 2012: Budget has been reduced. PIF clearance is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Yes
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 17, 2012	August 01, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 13, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Only activities required for project preparation should be covered under PPG. Some activities that can be implemented under the main project, such as activity 4 on development of national and regional awareness strategy should be removed.  ES, July 13, 2012: Activities have been adjusted. -Comment cleared

	2. Is itemized budget justified?	At \$50,000 the budget is too high. The budget should not exceed \$30,000-35,000. ES, July 13, 2012: The budget has been reduced to \$35,000. -Comment cleared
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this time. The budget is too high. ES, July 13, 2012: PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 14, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

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