



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

Project Type: Medium-sized Project

Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening capacities for the sound management of pesticides including POPs			
Country	Uruguay	GEF Project ID	5144
GEF Agency	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	615540
Other Executing Partner(s)	Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVTOMA)	Submission Date:	10/02/2015
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals – POPs	Project Duration (Months)	42 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	178,033

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CHEM-1	Outcome 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner.	Output 1.4.1 Strategies for the disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides, and for the remediation of contaminated sites developed and implemented.	GEFTF	1,874,028	7,258,000
Total Project Costs				1,874,028	7,258,000

B. Project Framework

Project Objectives: To safely dispose of obsolete pesticides including POPs and containers, and to strengthen the lifecycle management of pesticides in Uruguay.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Reduction of stocks and elimination of	TA	Outcome 1.1: Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal	1.1.1 MGAP and DINAMA trainers trained in inventory	GEFTF	348,923	3,556,000

<p>obsolete pesticides and containers</p>		<p>of POPs and obsolete pesticides and through built capacities on remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil</p> <p><i><u>Main indicators:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>TT CHEM indicator 1.4.2:</u></i> <i>Obsolete pesticides, including POPs pesticides, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner: 160 Tons</i></p> <p><i><u>TT CHEM indicator 1.4.2.4:</u></i> <i>Waste management plans to prevent further accumulation of pesticide stockpiles and empty pesticide containers, in place: Target 3: Management Plans budgeted and implemented</i></p> <p><i>12 collection centers fully operational, well equipped and staffed</i></p> <p><i>50% of empty containers treated and recycled</i></p> <p>Outcome 1.2: Capacities developed for site remediation</p>	<p>planning, safeguard and storage of hazardous waste and environmental assessment of contaminated sites</p> <p>1.1.2 Staff of DINAMA, MGAP, FAGRO and local governments trained in obsolete pesticides and contaminated sites</p> <p>1.1.3 Completed inventory of stocks of obsolete pesticides including POPs</p> <p>1.1.4 Strengthened private sector capacity for the elimination of obsolete pesticides, including POPs, and empty containers</p> <p>1.1.5 Empty container management strengthened, extending the network of collection centers and recycling facilities</p> <p>1.2.1 Guidelines for the private sector, including specific site remediation proposals.</p>			
<p>Component 2: Strengthening the legal framework and institutional capacity for the rational and integral</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Outcome 2.1: Legislative and regulatory framework for the environmentally sound management of POPs and pesticides is improved</p>	<p>2.1.1 Pesticide regulations reviewed and updated</p> <p>2.1.2 Current registration and</p>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>243,013</p>	<p>597,000</p>

<p>management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle</p>		<p><u>Main indicators:</u></p> <p><u>TT CHEM indicator</u> <u>1.4.2.3: Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place: Target 3:</u> <i>Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget</i></p> <p><i>10 officials from DINAMA and MGAP trained in ERA.</i></p> <p><i>Three highly used active ingredients are assessed using ERA</i></p>	<p>authorization system assessed, gaps and capacity building needs identified, and measures implemented</p> <p>2.1.3 Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) models included in the training of institutions.</p> <p>2.1.4 Adoption of the ERA tool to support the registration of pesticides.</p> <p>2.1.5 ERA performed to assess highly used ingredients.</p> <p>2.1.6 Improved pesticides information system.</p>			
<p>Component 3: Promoting Integrated Pest Management (IPM), pesticide sound use and management, and other alternatives to hazardous pesticides, through demonstration units</p>	<p>INV</p>	<p>Outcome 3.1: The use of toxic pesticides reduced through the adoption of IPM and other alternatives</p> <p><u>Main indicators:</u> <i>200 tons of toxic pesticides reduced (50 T/year)</i></p> <p><i>6 demonstration areas applying alternatives to highly toxic pesticides</i></p>	<p>3.1.1 IPM strategies and other alternatives for priority crops developed and field tested</p> <p>3.1.2 Two alternatives to highly toxic pesticides identified, evaluated, tested, including IPM and Integrated Crop Management (ICM)</p> <p>3.1.3 Training in practices of ICM & IPM and application of alternatives to toxic pesticides delivered to agriculture workers, and</p>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>755,613</p>	<p>1,172,000</p>

		<p>Outcome 3.2: Increased awareness on effects of conventional pesticides and on alternatives available</p> <p><i>Main indicators:</i></p> <p><i>42 field days conducted with the participation of 1,200 farmers, contractors, extensionists and TA providers</i></p>	<p>farmers/producers.</p> <p>3.2.1 A communication strategy developed and implemented to raise awareness on the effects on human health and the environment, and support the dissemination of good practices.</p>			
<p>Component 4: Strengthening environmental monitoring and response to risks from hazardous pesticides</p>	TA	<p>Outcome 4.1: Enhanced Capacity for monitoring and timely response to pesticide risks to human health and the environment</p> <p><i>Main indicators:</i></p> <p><i>Inter-institutional agreement formalized between DINAMA, MGAP, LATU, UdelaR, and Departments</i></p> <p><i>Harmonized laboratory and field protocols for environmental monitoring of pesticides</i></p> <p><i>Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINANA and MSP)</i></p>	<p>4.1.1 A coordination mechanism for environmental monitoring and response to pesticide risks established.</p> <p>4.1.2 Harmonized technical and analytical requirements for monitoring pesticide contaminants in environmental matrices (soil, water, sediments and biota) defined.</p> <p>4.1.3 Detailed action protocol for responding to contamination risks and events developed.</p> <p>4.1.4 Strengthened institutional capacity for environmental monitoring of pesticides.</p> <p>4.1.5 Sites in at least 3 watersheds selected for monitoring and analysis of pesticide contamination.</p>	GEFTF	356,113	1,833,000

			4.1.6 Measures to minimize pesticide contamination in watersheds identified and implemented.			
				Subtotal	1,703,662	7,158,000
				Project management Cost (PMC)	170,366	100,000
				Total project costs	1,874,028	7,258,000

C. Sources of Confirmed Co-financing for the Project by Source and by Name (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
Government	Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment	In-kind	1,608,000
Government	Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment	Grant	400,000
Government	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries	In-kind	1,080,000
Government	OSE	In-kind	1,250,000
Private Sector	AC Campo Limpio	Grant	2,620,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	200,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	100,000
Total Co-financing			7,258,000

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency, Focal Area and Country

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total C=A+B
FAO	GEFTF	POPs	Uruguay	1,874,028	178,033	2,052,061
Total Grant Resources				1,874,028	178,033	2,052,061

F. Consultants Working for Technical Assistance Components:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants ¹	45,000		45,000
National/Local Consultants	380,800	127,160	507,960

G. Does the Project Include a "Non-Grant" Instrument? NO

¹ International consultants include regional consultants.

Part II: Project Justification

A. Describe any changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF²

As a result of project preparation, no major changes were made to the design included in the PIF. Project objectives, components, outcomes and budgets remain unchanged. Based on additional information generated during the preparation process, as well as relevant decisions made by GOU since PIF submission, appropriate adjustments were made to some of the key indicators, the institutional roles and responsibilities, and the co-financing amounts, as follows:

In the original PIF, Component 1 had two broad objectives: to safely dispose POPs and other obsolete pesticides and to remediate contaminated sites. Since the submission of the PIF, some key actions with respect to operational safeguarding of pesticides have taken place. As explained in detail in the Project Document (see Box 1 in Page 13), in 2013 the Government of Uruguay enacted Decree 152/13: *Environmentally Appropriate Management of Waste resulting from the Use of Chemical, Biological and other products in Agriculture, Horticultural and Forestry*. The Decree (i) introduced the principle of mandatory recovery and *extended responsibility*: i.e. the private sector is now responsible for managing agrochemical waste and stocks in the post-consumption stage, and (ii) entrusted DINAMA with the responsibility of enforcing sound pesticide and chemical waste management (both containers and obsolete pesticides) through the approval of management plans to be submitted by private and public stakeholders..

In response to this, the private sector (manufacturers, importers and retailers of pesticides) created the Civil Association *Campo Limpio* in order to centralize and coordinate the preparation and implementation of the mandatory management plans. *Campo Limpio* has prepared a draft Management Plan involving the participation of private actors that manage agro-chemical containers. In September 2014, this Management Plan was in the final stages of approval by DINAMA³ and adoption by *Campo Limpio*. The practical implication of Decree 152 on the project is that the implementation of activities related to disposal of obsolete pesticides and empty containers (including the operation of the collection centers) will be under the responsibility of the private sector through *Campo Limpio*.

With regards to indicators and targets, the PIF originally included the disposal of 300 tons of obsolete pesticides as a tentative output. However, during full project preparation, baseline analyses determined that this value would be difficult to achieve because a significant proportion of obsolete pesticide stocks are highly fragmented in small quantities stored in private facilities (mainly local distributors, contractors and producers). Due to this, the original target was revised to 160 tons of obsolete pesticides disposed, and the budget has been reduced accordingly (see the budget line *Obsolete Disposal*, Project Budget, Appendix 3 of the Project Document). In addition, 200 tn of toxic pesticides will be replaced (see Component 3, Appendix 1 of the Project Document).

For more details, see Section 1 and Appendix 1 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessment under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e., NAPAs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

N/A

² For questions A.1 – A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since the PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet of the PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

³ As detailed in Section 1, DINAMA has the mandate of approving the management plans submitted by the private sector for soundly managing agro-chemicals, stocks, and obsoletes.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

The project contributes to the implementation of the GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy. It focuses on: CHEM-1, more specifically the management, prevention and disposal of POPs wastes and sound environmental management of contaminated sites. The project will dispose of about 160 tonnes of existing obsolete pesticides and increase the safe management of empty containers to about 50% of the total number consumed. To prevent future mismanagement, focus will also be on strengthening institutional capacity to improve and enforce pesticide regulations.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage

N/A

A.4 The baseline project and the problem it seeks to address

The baseline analysis and problem description remained mostly unchanged since PIF submission. There have been some improvements based on the data collected and analyses developed during full project preparation. Please see Section 1.2 of the FAO GEF Project Document for further details.

A.5 Incremental cost reasoning:

The incremental reasoning remained mostly unchanged since PIF submission. It has been further refined based on the analyses conducted during the full project preparation. Please see section 1.2 b) and c) in the FAO GEF Project Document for more details.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks

No significant risks are foreseen, given the full project integration with Uruguay's policies and environmental priorities. However, the achievement of the project's objectives may experience some delays as a result of the strong role of the private sector in the pesticide management process, the need to generate adequate public-private coordination mechanisms, the limited knowledge of sound pesticide use and management approaches in the private sector. Risks have been assessed during full project preparation. Mitigation measures are proposed in Table 4, and where appropriate, will be further elaborated in the EMP.

Table 4: Project Risks and Mitigation Measures

RISK	OCCURRENCE / PROBABILITY	MITIGATION MEASURES
Delays in the adoption of updated norms and procedures, and lack of inter-institutional coordination.	Medium	Campaigns of promotion and awareness-raising for Government representatives and staff, the commercial sector and end users. The project will support the operation of the inter-ministerial working group created by MGAP to coordinate actions and assess the current legal framework for the management of pesticides.

Limited collaboration of the private sector and the producers to support the project, in particular shipping containers to collection centers, and identification of stocks of obsolete pesticides and any eventual contaminated sites.	Low	Complementing the activities carried out during the preparation of the project, significant efforts will be devoted during implementation to raising awareness on the effects of obsolete pesticides and the importance of participation of agricultural producers in the project. The commercial sector has already formalized its support to the new regulations for the management of pesticides and expressed its support to the objectives and activities of this project.
The budget available is not sufficient for the environmentally sound disposal of identified stockpiles of obsolete pesticides.	Low	According to current regulations, importers and formulators of pesticides will be responsible for the disposal of obsolete stocks. Should the available budget be insufficient, the private sector will be responsible for the proper storage of pesticides and covering the financial gap.

A.7 Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

N/A

B. Additional information not addressed at the PIF stage

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

A number of public and private entities, including trade, commercial, producer organizations and NGOs, are closely associated with the management of the lifecycle of pesticides in Uruguay. The successful implementation of this project foresees their participation. The Table below describes the stakeholders and their roles.

Project Stakeholders and Roles

STAKEHOLDER	ROLE IN THE PROJECT
National Directorate of Environment (DINAMA) (MVTOMA)	Leading national partner. Coordinate project implementation and project management along with the GEF Agency (FAO). Ensure close collaboration with other ministries and participating entities.
General Directorate of Agricultural Services (DGSA) (MGAP)	Support project implementation, particularly pesticide registration, in close collaboration with DINAMA, FAO, other

(including laboratories)	ministries and participating entities.
General Directorate of Renewable Natural Resources (RENARE) (MGAP)	Support project implementation, particularly demo network implantation, in close collaboration with DINAMA, FAO, other ministries and participating entities.
Ministry of Public Health (MSP)	Support project implementation by providing inputs and expertise on pesticide related health issues.
Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MTSS)	Support project by providing inputs and expertise on occupational health aspects.
National Water and Sanitation Company (OSE)	Support the implementation of project activities related to the use of pesticides in strategic watersheds.. Conduct water sampling and analysis for pesticide monitoring.
Other MGAP's agencies and projects (General Directorate of Horticulture - DIGEGRA, National Institute of Agricultural Research -INIA, National Dairy Institute-INALE, National Viticulture Institute -INAVI, SNIA, DACC).	Participate in project implementation by providing inputs and experiences on the adaptation and adoption of technologies related to the rational use of pesticides at general and sector level, including specific implementation of demo units and associated training events
Commerce Chamber of Agrochemical Products (CAMAGRO) Civil Association <i>Campo Limpio</i> Other recycling companies	Participate in project activities related to the management of collection centers for empty pesticide containers, and the elimination of obsolete pesticides stocks.
Latin American Network for Action against Pesticides (RAPAL) Network of Environmental NGOs	Participate in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of civil society in the use and sound management of pesticides, as well as in public awareness.
Private Sector: RMK, ALUR, AUSID and Oilseeds Technological Bureau	Support the implementation of the project regarding IPM development, demonstration and dissemination.
Rural communities, producers and their organizations	Beneficiaries of the project. Contribution to the management of empty containers. Recipients of technical assistance, training and awareness-raising project activities.

Source: Based on research and consultations by the project preparation team.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

The project will generate important socio-economic benefits through the reduction of direct exposure of the population to toxic chemicals and associated contaminated environments, by: a) identifying and eliminating obsolete pesticides; b) strengthening the program of recycling of empty pesticide containers; and c) implementing actions to improve the life cycle pesticides management.

The promotion and adoption of improved pest management practices will contribute to the reduction of crop losses by weeds, insects and other pathogens while also reducing the costs of chemical inputs, thus improving overall financial benefits to farms adopting the technologies promoted by the project. By helping reduce the dependence on chemical pesticides, including POPs, the project will contribute to the prevention

of future accumulation of obsolete pesticides and will support the achievement of global environmental benefits and sustainability.

The project will generate community's health benefits by: a) eliminating pesticides stockpiles that are stored in containers at public or private facilities; b) removing contaminated containers from rural households/production units; c) generating and promoting the adoption of alternative pesticides use and management, and d) improving the quality of marketed products, regulated through the registration and control system throughout the pesticides life cycle.

Due to their roles and traditional responsibilities in rural areas, women are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of pesticides, since they constitute the bulk of the workforce in pre- and post-harvest activities horticultural products, whether for marketing or for domestic consumption. As well, teachers in rural areas are traditionally women. Rural schools are particular exposed to agrochemical use and spraying, and have a key role in raising awareness on sound pesticides management among the farming families. Project activities will take into account the gender dimension, ensuring women's participation in the capacity development, demonstration, and risk reduction activities at field level. At institutional level, Uruguay has already mainstreamed gender dimensions in the public sector and women are equally represented and present in public decisions. See more details in Section 5.1 and 5.4 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design

Cost effectiveness will be achieved through i) investing resources in activities and areas where there is a significant potential impact and high probability of sustainability and replication; and ii) supporting an integrated approach that includes all aspects of the pesticides management and their lifecycle.

Originally, the PIF included the disposal of 300 tons of obsolete pesticides as a possible outcome. However, during full project preparation baseline analyses determined that this value would be difficult to achieve because a significant proportion of obsolete pesticide stocks are highly fragmented in small quantities stored in private facilities (mainly local distributors, contractors and producers). At the same time, subsequent to the PIF preparation and approval, the environmental authority (DINAMA) began a process of transferring responsibilities to the private sector, specifically to CAMAGRO and the *Campo Limpio* program (an initiative developed by CropLife Latin America)⁴. In the framework of the Decree 152/013⁵, *Campo Limpio* prepared a draft Management Plan for agro-chemical containers and obsolete stocks - based on the principles of mandatory recovery of containers and extended responsibility. The Management Plan involves the participation of private actors that manage agro-chemical containers. In September 2014, this Management Plan is in process of approval by DINAMA⁶ and adoption by *Campo Limpio*.

The important progress made through the above initiatives was a key element for the review of the strategy and methodology of the project. As such, the revised design prioritizes the support to the implementation and operation of this new scheme of distribution of institutional responsibilities between the public and private sectors, as well as the consequent strengthening of training and dissemination instruments of improved knowledge and practices for all members of the lifecycle of pesticides, in particular the end users (agricultural producers and their organizations).

C. Describe the budgeted M&E Plan

⁴ For a full description of this process, please refer to Section 1 of this Project Document.

⁵ Approved in May 2013. See a full description in Section 1.

⁶ As detailed in Section 1, DINAMA has the mandate of approving the management plans submitted by the private sector for soundly managing agro-chemicals, stocks, and obsoletes.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and results indicators established in the project results framework and annual work plans and budgets. M&E activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The M&E plan, which has been budgeted at US\$ 82,000 will be reviewed and updated during the project inception phase. This will involve: (i) review of the project's results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators, as necessary; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and action to be taken to collect the information; and (iv) clarification of M&E roles and responsibilities of project stakeholders. The project's M&E system will be put in place within the first 6 months of project implementation.

The operation of the project's M&E, as well as the consolidation and data processing system will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinating Unit (UCP) headed by the Project Coordinator. This ongoing work will be closely linked to the process of preparation and execution of annual work plan and budgets (AWP/B), six-monthly Project Progress Reports (PPRs), and Project Implementation Review (PIR). The preparation of the AWP/B and the PPRs will represent the result of a unified planning process involving the main participants of the project. As a tool to adopt a results-based management, the AWP/B will identify the actions proposed for the following year and will provide the necessary data on the goals to be achieved, while the semi-annual reports will present the results of the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the progress made with regard to the goals. Annually, the UCP will organize a review and planning workshop with representatives of all participating institutions. This workshop will be scheduled as an activity prior to the annual meeting of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to be played by the Inter-institutional Coordination Committee (CCI). The AWP/B will be prepared in a manner consistent with the project results framework to ensure proper compliance and monitoring of project outcomes and outputs.

Indicators and information sources

In order to follow up on project products and results, including contributions to comply with global environmental benefits, a set of indicators have been developed (see the Results Framework in Appendix 1 of the FAO GEF Project Document). Following FAO's procedures of monitoring and progress, the data collected report formats will have a level of detail sufficient to allow the tracking of results and specific products and to anticipate possible project risks. Product indicators will be monitored semi-annually while result indicators will be measured annually to the extent possible, or at least as part of the mid-term review and the final evaluation.

The network of producers linked to the demonstration farms (to be established as part of Component 3) will also be an important source of information for the M&E system. The data collected from the network will serve as a complement to the information generated on the participation of producers in the removal of obsolete pesticides, containers management systems and advances in knowledge, attitudes and practices related to the use and rational management of pesticides.

The indicators for products and results of the project are designed to monitor biophysical and socio-economic impacts, and effective progress in the development and consolidation of capacities of institutions, private sector and rural producers to dispose safely of obsolete pesticides, including POPs and to strengthen the capacity for the integrated management of pesticides in Uruguay.

The indicators may be improved or adjusted, as needed, in consultation with project stakeholders during the initial phase of the project. This process of refinement of project indicators facilitate a greater involvement of the participants in the project and a broader support for the monitoring and reporting of achievements and difficulties experienced by the project.

The main sources of information to support the M&E plan include: i) monitoring systems of the National Directorate of Environment (DINAMA) and the General Directorate of Agricultural Services (DGSA) ii) participatory workshops for review of progress with institutions and beneficiaries; III) in-situ monitoring of the implementation of good practices; (iv) six-monthly project progress reports (PPRs) prepared by the Project Coordinator with inputs from DINAMA, DGSA, Ministry of Public Health (MSP), project specialists and other

stakeholders; (v) consultant reports; vi) training reports; (vii) mid-term review and final evaluation; (viii) financial reports and budget reviews; ix) annual project implementation reviews (PIRs) prepared by the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) in FAO with the support of the FAO representation in Uruguay, based on inputs from the Project Coordinator; and (x) reports of supervision missions conducted by FAO.

GEF-5 Tracking Tool: Following the GEF policies and procedures, the GEF Chemical Focal Area Tracking Tool has been compiled as part of project preparation and will be submitted at three moments: (i) together with the project document at CEO endorsement; (ii) at project mid-term; and (iii) at project end. The information will be updated by the Project Coordinator with support from the LTO at project mid-term and prior to closing. The Project Monitoring and evaluation plan summary follows:

Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

Monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	Project Coordinator, PSC/CCI, CST, FAO (FAO Uruguay as Budget Holder - BH, FAO Lead Technical Officer and Technical Unit - LTO and LTU, FAO GEF Coordination Unit)	Within first six months of project inception	US\$ 10,000
Inception report	Project Coordinator (PC) with inputs from the Project Monitoring Committee (CTS) and project partners. Cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, and the PSC/CCI.	Immediately after the project inception workshop	US\$ 1,500
Design and implementation of the M&E system, including staff training	PC with support from FAO LTO and LTU.	Within the first six months after project inception	US\$ 1,500
Field-based impact monitoring	PC with support from other project partners - local NGOs, farmers/producers associations.	Permanent	US\$ 3,000
Monitoring missions	FAO LTO/LTU	Annual or as required.	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Project progress reports (PPRs)	Project Coordinator Submitted to the BH and LTU for clearance. Finalized reports submitted to the FAO GEF Unit by the LTO, and to the PSC/CCI by the PC.	Semi-annually	US\$ 3,000
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO LTO with inputs from the PC, BH and LTU. Submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat. Final report also submitted to the PSC/CCI and the GEF Operational Focal Point.	Annually	Paid by GEF Agency fee

Monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Co-financing Reports	PC with information from all co-financing partners.	Six monthly and annually as part of PPR and PIR.	US\$ 1,500
PSC meetings	Project Coordinator, PSC Chair, FAO BH	At least once a year	US\$ 5,000
Technical reports	PC, Consultants, FAO LTO/LTU	As appropriate	From component budgets and fee
Mid -term review	UCP, FAO LTO, LTU in consultation with the project team and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	US\$ 15,000
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent Evaluation Office (OED) in consultation with the project team and other partners	At the end of project implementation	US\$ 40,000
Final report	UCP, FAO LTO	At least one month before end of project	US\$ 1,500
		TOTAL M&E Budget	US\$ 82,000

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Silvia Fernandez	GEF National Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Housing, Territorial Planning and Environment (MVTOMA)	September 10 th 2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		10 February 2015	Vicente Plata, FAO Representative Assistant in Uruguay and Alberto Pantoja, Plant Production Officer, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (RLC)	+598290125 10 ext. 113	Vicente.plata@fao.org Alberto.pantoja@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator. FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division. FAO				+3906 57055680	GEF- Coordination- Unit@fao.org

Annex 1: Project Results Framework. (either copy and paste the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found)

Please see Appendix 1 in the FAO Project Document on page 65. A detailed Results Budget is attached in Appendix 3 on page 84.

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)

N/A

Annex C: Status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: US\$ 50,228			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
5011 Salaries Professional (Parent)	2,843	2,843.00	
5013 Consultants (Parent)	43,600	46,242	3,986
5021 Travel (Parent)	3,400	0	
5023 Training (Parent)	385	0	
Total	50,228	46,242	3,986

Annex D: Calendar of expected reflows (if non-grant instrument is used)

N/A