



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4998 | | |
| Country/Region: | Uruguay | | |
| Project Title: | Environmental Sound Life-Cycle Management of Mercury Containing Products and their Wastes | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 5084 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | POPs |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | CHEM-3; Others; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$700,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$2,595,700 | Total Project Cost: | \$3,295,700 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Evelyn Swain | Agency Contact Person: | Dr. Suely Carvalho |

| 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. | |
| | 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.

¹ 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 ¹ | 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 ¹ | 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 indigeneous 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 ¹ | 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? | <p>Co-financing is a 1:2.8 ratio which is lower than typical POPs projects.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Component 1: \$30,000 Component 2: \$140,000 Component 3: \$300,000 Component 4: \$90,000 Component 5: \$40,000</p> <p>ES, June 13, 2012: The budget has been reduced from \$930,000 to \$700,000. - Comment cleared</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|--|--|
| | 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. | |
| | 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 | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | 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? | | |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Review Date (s) | First review* | May 17, 2012 | |
| | 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? | |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being 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.