

Consolidating biodiversity and land conservation policies and actions as pillars of sustainable development

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID
10081

Countries
Uruguay

Project Title
Consolidating biodiversity and land conservation policies and actions as pillars of sustainable development

GEF Agency(ies)
UNDP

Agency ID
UNDP: 6252

GEF Focal Area(s)
Multi Focal Area

Program Manager
Mark Zimsky

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes the project is clearly consistent with BD and LD strategies for GEF-7.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes, Table B is comprehensive and focused on a clear set of objectives and outcomes and linked directly to the core indicators.

Agency Response

Reponse to 11/16/2018 GEFSEC comments re Rio Marker, cofinancing table. and core indicators

Rio Marker. There is no explicit reference to climate change adaptation in the PIF. The climate change mitigation should be 1 as was in the PIF and climate change adaptation should remain as 0 as they are on the PIF. There was a problem with taxonomy on the portal (page 1 of entry). This appears to have been resolved with the assistance of GEF IT staff / UNDP PA.

The co-financing table has been updated to indicate US\$1m in in-kind co-financing from MVOTMA is classified as "recurrent expenditures".

Core indicator information – it is not clear if this was user error or a software issue with the portal. Indicators 3, 4 and 11 have been updated on the Portal to match PIF hard copy.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes, cofinancing is adequately documented and consistent with requirements of the policy guidelines. The resources identified as investment mobilized meet the definition of the policy.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes all financing is line with GEF policies.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/16/2018

A request for higher PPG amount is requested; please provide justification.

Agency Response

There seems to be an issue in the portal. The text explanation was included in previous submission in the text box below PPG Section E. (screen shot pasted below). This box and text does not seem to appear when the PIF is submitted to GEFSEC. The same text is being added as a note in new Annex F on the portal

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes and supported by Annex B.

Please clarify if there any mitigation benefits expected from the project and if so include them in Table F.

11/10/2018

Adequate clarification provided by agency.

Agency Response

Yes, the project is expected to produce climate change mitigation benefits as a result of the implementation of restoration activities over 16,000 ha. The expected direct climate change mitigation of 66,643 tCO₂-eq will be delivered over a five-year period (life of the project). These are preliminary estimates that have been calculated using the national methodology developed by the Climate Change Directorate of the MVOTMA following IPCC guidelines; these estimates will be reviewed in detail during the PPG phase and will include the use of FAO's EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT). Table F (Part I: Project Information) and Annex B (GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet) have been updated accordingly.

The assumptions for the calculations are as follows:

1. Native forest (2,000 hectares [ha]): 60% of the area is mature primary forest in both scenarios (with and without project); 40% of the area is forest that is growing at a rate of 2 m³/ha/year in the scenario without the project, and a rate of 4 m³/ha/ year under the scenario with the project; a basic density of the wood of 0.925 ton m.s./m³ of wet volume; a biomass expansion factor of 1.2; an aerial/root ratio of 0.24; and a carbon fraction of 0.47 t C / t m.s. This estimate includes only carbon sequestration in living biomass (aerial and below-ground). Carbon sequestration was not considered for other carbon reservoirs (soil organic carbon, dead organic matter, and litter).

2. Grasslands (8,000 ha): Increase of soil organic carbon at a rate of 0.2 t C/ha/year (scenario with the project).
3. Agricultural area (5,000 ha): Increase of soil organic carbon at a rate of 0.2 t C/ha/year (scenario with the project).
4. Wetlands (1,000 ha): No emission reductions were assumed.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes thorough and appropriate tagging included.

11/16/2018

Explanation on CC mitigation taxonomy also clarified in communication with the Agency.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes, clear exposition of the problem and the barriers to addressing them to generate global environmental benefits.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes a very thorough and specific presentation of the baseline projects and overall investments is presented.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes a methodical and thorough presentation of the alternative scenario is presented by component and outcome.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. Clear alignment with BD 1-1, and BD 2-7 and LD 1-1.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. A very clear presentation of the incremental cost reasoning with a very concise table of the alternative and expected GEBs.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes for the most part.

Please clarify why the hectares presented in the Table under anticipated GEBs are significantly less and different than the hectares presented in Table F.

11/10/2018

Yes, adequate clarification provided by agency.

Agency Response

The number of hectares (ha) presented in the table under anticipated GEBs (Section 6/Project Description) was updated to match the number of hectares (ha) presented in Table F (Part I: Project Information) as follows:

- 35,000 ha of new PAs incorporated into the SNAP
- 289,814 ha of PAs under improved management effectiveness (Terrestrial PAs: 194,495 ha; Marine PAs: 95,319)
- 16,000 ha of ecosystems restored
- 6,000 ha of private reserves
- 100,000 ha under sustainable land management in production systems

Total: 446,814 ha

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. The strategies being employed to conserve biodiversity and reduce land degradation include a mix of economic incentives, regulations and financial instruments and a proactive engagement with the private sector, a comprehensive combination of strategies that have not been applied in Uruguay and which provide a framework for post-project sustainability.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. At the time of CEO endorsement, please provide more detailed maps of the four sites currently identified only with circular markings on the map. Please ensure the coordinates are accurate as well.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. Stakeholder engagement is adequately presented at this stage.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes, gender context clearly articulated and adequate.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes and essential given the nature of the country's agriculture and tourism sector and their impact on biodiversity, protected areas and land. The project strategy reflects the need for intelligent and informed engagement with the private sector beginning in the PPG phase.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes adequate identification of risks and initial mitigation measures are sufficient; please develop these further during the project design phase.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. By the time of CEO endorsement please clearly explain the coordination mechanisms that will be employed and supported by the projects implementation structure and how this will be financed as necessary. Please also clarify by the time of CEO endorsement how the previous

GEF project on protected areas implemented by UNDP and funded in GEF-6 has informed the theory of change and final design of this project.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes the project is fully consistent with the NBSAP and the TSP LDN.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes. Project embeds the KM activities in Component three.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Yes in a letter dated 9/17/2018.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Additional Comments

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

Numerous requests have been made about what is expected in the project design and documentation by the time of CEO endorsement, please be sure to address these by the time of CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>