



## 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>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$930,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,612,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$3,542,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ibrahima Sow</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.	
	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.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	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	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes it aligns with Chem 3.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	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.	
	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.	
	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.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve		

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?		
	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.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes the framework is sound.	
	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.	
	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.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, public participation and CSOs roles are identified.	
	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.	
	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	

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.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	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.	
	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	
	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.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this time, budget needs to be reduced.	
	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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.