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

GEF ID:	**5144**		
Country/Region:	**Uruguay**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening Capacities for the Sound Management of Pesticides Including POPs**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**POPs**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CHEM-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,228**	Project Grant:	**$1,874,028**
Co-financing:	**$7,258,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$9,182,256**
PIF Approval:	**February 22, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Anil Sookdeo**	Agency Contact Person:	**Vicente Plata,**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes	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	Yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	No	No
	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.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes	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	Yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes	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	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 PIF indicated that approximately 300 Tons of obsolete POPs pesticides and other pesticides were being targeted. The changes of the amounts to 160 tonnes of pesticides and some

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	similar benefits?		POPs changes the scope of the project. The explanations provided in the MSP proposal do not satisfactorily address the expected changes in financing with this change in scope of the project. 3/3/15 AS - the proponents have reduced the costs of the project in line with appropriate cost effectiveness - comment cleared
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Yes	Yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes	Yes
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes	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?	Yes	Yes
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes	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	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes	Yes
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes	Yes
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		There has been a change in the scope of the project as originally proposed. Please explain why the costs have not been revised. 3/3/15 AS - comment cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes	Yes
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	No. Please reduce component 2 to 200,000. Nov 2, 2012 - Comment addressed, however it is not acceptable to add the amount removed from component 2 to component 1. The level of financing in component 1 was appropriate in the first submission of the PIF. Please revise. November 19 - Comment addressed - cleared	The project is overvalued given the reduction in the project targets. 3/3/15 AS - Comment cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is appropriate	Co-financing is confirmed
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes	Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes
	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	
	• Convention Secretariat?	None Received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	None - received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	This is a well thought out proposal, however the cost of the legislative component is to high. Other projects have accomplised similar work with lower fudning levels from the GEF. Pending budget revision. Nov 2, 2012 - The budgets have been rearranged without the reductions suggested in the 1st review. Please address. November 19 - Comments have been addressed. PIF recommended for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG		Yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval	with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Pending clarifications and possible reductions in the budget. 3/3/15 AS - The project can be approved.
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 01, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 02, 2012	March 03, 2015
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The PPG amount - $50,000 - falls within the range of the PIF project grant.
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	PPG approval recommended
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.