## Audit Trail Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Page and paragraph** | **Comment** | **Evaluator’s answer** | **Changes** |
| 1 | Portada | Utilizar logo actualizado del PNUD (no lleva la leyenda Empowered lives..) |  | Logo changed throughout the entire document |
| 2 | Portada | Creo que Podemos eliminar esto, ya que tenemos los logos |  | **United Nations Development Programme Green Climate Fund** deleted |
| 3 | Portada | Añadir también el número de ID de GCF |  | **GCF ID** added |
| 4 | Opening - page i | Además debemos añadir la fecha de comienzo de la TE y fecha de cuando se finalizó |  | **Evaluation timeframe: from April 20th to June 23rd**, 2021 added |
| 5 | 1.1. Project Information Table – page 1 | The signed first revision of the Project Document has these dates as planned start date and planned end date.  However, as per GCF rules, the project start date is the date of the approval of the project, so the start date is January, 8th 2018, so the original end date was January, 7th 2021.  A 6 month COVID 19 extension was granted, so the revised end date is July 6th 2021. |  | The section has been rewritten  **Planned start date: January 8th, 2018**  **Original end date; January 7th, 2021**  **Revised end date: July 6th, 2021** |
| 6 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 2 | Just make sure all of these are spelled out in the Acronyms (glossary) above | Done |  |
| 7 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 2 | Sugiero también comentar la NDC de Uruguay, una de cuyas metas es la realización del NAP para ciudades. |  | Added **The formulation of the NAP-Cities is also included as a target in the adaptation chapter of the Uruguay’s NDC (2017).** |
| 8 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 3 | All events that took place after (please provide date) so that it is clear that not ALL the events planned in -person were conducted virtually. | Correct Marzo 2020 | **Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, all events, which previously were presential turned into virtual and were implemented via on-line communication applications/platform.**  changed into  **In March 2020, because of the COVID-19 pandemic, all events, which previously were meant to be conducted in person turned into virtual and were implemented via on-line communication applications/platform.** |
| 9 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 3 | No entiendo el comentario.  Sugiero incluir que el avance del proyecto se realizó de acuerdo al marco establecido en el documento aprobado por el GCF (COUNTRY READINESS LOGICAL FRAMEWORK), o en la sección Marco de Resultados del Proyecto (en el Documento de Proyecto firmado a nivel país), donde se establecen valores de línea de base y de fin de proyecto para cada uno de los outputs/actividades | It is not neither judgement nor a comment. It is a statement: the project did not need an articulated M&E system. The M&E system is activity-based. There are no outcome to be monitored or measured.  In the chapter 4.2.a. Adaptive Management it is written The project was implemented in accordance to the ProDoc |  |
| 10 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 3 | Can you be more specific? You mean “technical assistance”, or “ | The project is implemented by UNDP in all its aspects. Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) | Added **in terms of project management** |
| 11 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 3 | ?? | The expression “Now of the evaluation” means “At the time of the evaluation”. It is an expression that I used commonly in my evaluation assignments | No changes |
| 12 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 3 | Can you be more specific? You mean “technical assistance”, or “ | The project is implemented by UNDP in all its aspects. Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) | Added **in terms of project management** |
| 13 | 1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions – page 3 | Solamente mencionar “municipios” | Corregido |  |
| 14 | 1.5. Synthesis of the key lessons learned – page 4 | Not clear what the actual “lesson” here is. Is it that all of the bullets below are lessons? | Here, I say that the project approach was successful. It is a sort of model project. The bullets are the main elements that turned the project into a model. Why do I say model? Because it confirms the validity of the UN approach. Unfortunately this is not always the case. |  |
| 15 | 1.5. Synthesis of the key lessons learned – page 4 | Revisar redacción. No se entiende bien |  | **represents the basis** changed into **is key** |
| 16 | 1.6. Recommendations Summary Table – p 5 | The Evaluator makes recommendations on the project evaluated. Not on other or future initiatives | See answer to comment #17 |  |
| 17 | 1.6. Recommendations Summary Table – p 5 | I don’t think this is acceptable. The TE recommendations must be made on THIS project and not on other projects. Further, it is still not clear what “Lesson No 1” is. And lastly, the recommendation reads more like a “lesson” than a recommendation. | I do not agree with the comment.  In fact the objective of the evaluation includes,as per GEF/UNDP guidance, "... aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming", which includes how to make the project (or project element) can be replicated in other contexts and programs. Also, I have no recommendations for this project for three reasons:  1. The project does not need them. The ratings are the highest possible, and I don't see how to improve it. In fact, this is the best project that I have evaluated in my entire career to date. All the actors interviewed are already clear about what they will do based on everything produced and capitalized during the project.  2. The project closes on July 6th. I must deliver the consolidated report to you by June 23rd. There is no time to implement any recommendation.  3. The only recommendation would have been for an extension. It is unnecessary, because the Team has already requested such an extension. I have included the "conclusion n.3" in the case you want to present my report to the donor to further substantiate your request for extension.  Finally, when reading the 4 lessons learned, you notice again that the evaluation considers the project almost as a model (lessons 1 and 2 are very significant in this sense), again highlighting its success.  In summary, when evaluated with the UNDP / GEF methodology, the project has turned out to be very successful. |  |
| 18 | 2.1. Evaluation purpose – p 5 | Not sure this is the purpose of the Evaluation. | This comes directly as it is from the guidance. It was included in the inception report as well. |  |
| 19 | 2.6. Limitations – p 7 | Revisar redacción. |  | **The occurrence of the Covid-19 pandemic and the necessity to conduct the evaluation remotely and project stakeholders were interviewed individually or in groups with on-line communication applications, with the International Evaluator working in home-office**  changed into  **Because of the occurrence of the Covid-19 pandemic and the consequent necessity to conduct the evaluation remotely, project stakeholders were interviewed individually or in groups with on-line communication applications, with the International Evaluator working in home-office** |
| 20 | 2.6. Limitations – p 7 | who supported in scheduling the | I found my original formulation “who set up the schedule of meetings.” more pertinent because it shows better the work done by the project team in organizing all my meetings. The suggested change it is not accepted. |  |
| 21 | 3.1. Project start and duration – p 7 | The signed first revision of the Project Document has May 2018 as planned start date and May 2021 as planned end date.  However, as per GCF rules, the project start date is the date of the approval of the project, so the start date was January, 8th 2018, and the original end date was January, 7th 2021.  A 6 month COVID 19 extension was granted, so the revised end date is July 6th 2021.  As per GCF rules, the project start date is the date of the approval of the project, so the start date is January, 8th 2018, and the original end date was January, 7th 2021. A 6 month COVID 19 extension was granted, so the revised end date is July 6th 2021. |  | The paragraph is change into  **The project start date was January, 8th 2018, and the original end date was January, 7th 2021. By decision of the donor, a 6 month COVID 19 extension was granted globally to all GCF funded projects, so the revised end date was July 6th 2021.** |
| 22 | 3.2. Development context – p 8 | Also include Uruguay’s NDC which has the NAP cities as a target in the adaptation chapter. |  | After the numbered bullets points, I added  **In addition, the NAP-Cities is included as a target in the adaptation chapter of the Uruguay’s NDC (2017).** |
| 23 | 3.2. Development context – p 8 | Yo acá también mencionaría la meta de la Primera NDC de Uruguay, de realizar un NAP para ciudadades a 2020 |  |  |
| 24 | 3.3. Problems that the project sought to address – p 9 | And the First NDC |  | Added **and the first Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC)** |
| 25 | 3.3. Problems that the project sought to address – p 9 | Acá también se podría mencionar la NDC | Please refer to comment 24 |  |
| 26 | 3.5. Expected results – p 9 | No. The 5 outputs do not refer to the 5 chapters of the NAP. | It is true, my mistake. The idea was to say that the five are essential elements of a NAP. | **The five outputs represent substantially the five main chapters constituting the National Adaptation Plan for cities and infrastructure of Uruguay.**  changed into  **The five outputs represent essential elements of the National Adaptation Plan for cities and infrastructure of Uruguay, which will be reflected in the document itself.** |
| 27 | 3.5. Expected results – p 9 | Ojo que esto no es así… No se a qué se hace referencia…. | Please refer to comment 26 |  |
| 28 | 3.5. Expected results – p 9 | Correct, but this is also because this is not requested by the donor. | The comment is contradictory with comment 32.  However, the statement is not a judgement. iT is just a matter of fact. All chapter 3 is not about the evaluation. It is an overview of the project as per its ProDoc.  Chapter 2 illustrates the methodology  Chapter 3 briefly introduce the project  Chapter 4 is the evaluation |  |
| 29 | 3.7. Main stakeholders – p 10 | ?? It does, in the section of “stakeholder engagement” | Please refer to comment 30 |  |
| 30 | 3.7. Main stakeholders – p 10 | En la Sección IV Resultados y Alianzas, bajo los títulos Asociaciones y Partes interesadas, se detallan todos los stakeholder del proyecto. Favor revisar | Si, los actores de mencionan pero no se menciona su rol y como involucrarlos. Reconozco que la redaccion no es de la mejores. Pero aqui quiero solo decir que no hay un plan donde se especifica el rol de cada actor. De hecho esa parte es libre como he escrito *“…representatives of Government institutions: central agencies, local governments and cities officials, as well as civil society organizations – including trade unions – research institutions, financial and technical partners, international non-governmental organization. The role and involvement of the private sector…”*  No se dicen cual seràn su roles y responsabilidad*.* | **The ProDoc does not identify any any stakeholders**  changed into  **The ProDoc does not identify any specific role for any stakeholders** |
| 32 | 3.8. Description of the project’s Theory of Change – p 10 | Double check? Newer NAP proposals do include a ToC | Double checked. A Theory of Change is not included. |  |
| 33 | 4.1.a. Description of project design – p 10 | Ver comentario anterior sobre Marco de Resultados del Proyecto y niveles de línea de base y final del proyecto | No hay un sistema de indicadores en el ProDoc. |  |
| 34 | 4.1.a. Description of project design – p 10 | Revisar redacción (informal?) |  | **quite** deleted |
| 35 | 4.1.a. Description of project design – p 10 | This is not accurate. The NAP Cities does not have these are chapters! The 5 outputs may be closely aligned to the LEG Guidelines on NAP elements, but not with the NAP Cities chapters… |  | **The five outputs represent substantially the five main chapters constituting the National Adaptation Plan for cities and infrastructure of Uruguay.**  changed into  **The five outputs represent essential elements of the National Adaptation Plan for cities and infrastructure of Uruguay, which will be reflected in the document itself. Briefly, the project aimed at the formulation of the said planning document in a participatory way so to integrate climate change adaptation coherently into development planning processes and strategies that apply to cities and local planning.** |
| 36 | 4.1.a. Description of project design – p 10 | Ojo con esto | Refer to comment 35 |  |
| 37 | 4.1.c. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design – p 12 | Y de la NDC |  | Added **and the NDC (2017)** |
| 38 | 4.1.e. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector – p 12 | En la sección VI del ProDoc, Gestión del Proyecto se menciona:  El MVOTMA proporcionará una oficina en Montevideo, donde se encontrará la Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto. Esto ofrece algunas oportunidades de sinergia de los recursos humanos, ya que existen varios proyectos e iniciativas del PNUD en Uruguay liderados por el MVOTMA actualmente en ejecución o en proceso de aprobación. Como la Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto para el NAP Ciudades estará en el MVOTMA, se podrán aprovechar los conocimientos técnicos adquiridos, así como las oportunidades para la creación de redes de los equipos de los proyectos | This is true. I cannot write that there is a generic chance to implement common activities and/or make synergies possible within different projects. Here I have to write if actual collaboration with other project are envisaged. And this is not the case. |  |
| 39 | 4.1.f. Gender responsiveness of project design – p 12 | Revisar redacción. No se entiende | I understand it, however I made some changes | **the development of training on integrating gender through the use of gender disaggregated data and gender analysis tools in programme formulation and monitoring for the enhancement of the capacity of government officials for planning, budgeting and implementation of adaptation measures with a gender sensitive approach.**  Changed into  **the development of training on integrating gender through the use of gender disaggregated data and gender analysis tools in programme formulation and monitoring. The training should aim at the enhancement of the capacity of government officials for planning, budgeting and implementation of adaptation measures with a gender sensitive approach.** |
| 40 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 12 | Yes, but let’s remember that the pandemic dates were different for Uruguay. The worst part of the pandemic hit the country between March and May 2021 as opposed to 2020. Please indicate dates here in order to be specific as of when the context changed for the project implementation. |  | Added **in March 2020** |
| 41 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 12 | Maybe it didn’t decrease, but it must have been impacted. Specify, please. | I did not registered any negative impact on this issue. The participation did not decrease. Actually, in the efficiency paragraph I wrote **The adoption of on-line platforms for organizing project events had as well a positive effect. In fact, it shortened the distances between the first and the other two level of administration. Briefly, events could enjoy the participation of actors from institutions geographically very distant. It is probable that events in presence could not reach the same level of participation, especially if we consider the distances between the various urban areas of the country.**  The impact of passing from a modality to another is not assessable. What I wrote in efficiency is all I could do. Nobody could tell me more than that. Stakeholders reported to me that the transition was well managed and events were still pertinent and interesting for them. I cannot say which is the impact, because I just have one scenario (the actual one, i.e. the transition). i.e. people judged the transition, not what would have occurred if COVID-19 had not happened.  What I wrote, is the only effect/impact that I can highlight. |  |
| 42 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | I would revise this to say that the GCF granted a 6- month extension to every project in the portfolio, in order to allow additional time to make up for delays incurred due to COVID-19, between March and June 2020. However, the peak of the pandemic hit Uruguay until Q1 2021, when the project team and the Government requested UNDP and GCF a second extension. In other words, it needs to be explained that the first extension was “granted by GCF” and not really requested by Uruguay, due to COVID. |  | **The COVID pandemic made two no-cost extensions necessary to complete satisfactorily the project’s activities:**  **• The first extension followed the decision of GCF to authorize an extension of six months to all projects, because of the pandemic. However, the project was granted only with a no-cost extension of six months.**  **• Now of the evaluation, UNDP submitted the request for the second no-cost extension to the donor (four months)**  **The evaluation exercise considers the two requests of no-cost extensions as very relevant and fully justified.**  changed into  **Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a no-cost extension was granted in April 2021 to the project following the decision of the GCF to grant an extension of six months to some Readiness Programme and Project Preparation Facility grants in its portfolio. Now of the evaluation, UNDP submitted the request for the second no-cost extension to the donor (four months). The evaluation exercise considers the request of the second no-cost extension as very relevant and fully justified. It is necessary mainly to implement dissemination activities.** |
| 43 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | Acá no habría que decir que a los efectos reales del proyecto la extensión por covid no significó ningún cambio en nuestro workplan? Por el tema de la fecha administrativa del comienzo del proyecto? GCF toma el inicio en Enero 2018 y en realidad comenzó en Julio 2018. Por tanto nuestro workplan siempre fue desde julio 2018- a julio 2021. La extensión solo dejó formalmente la fecha en la que ya teníamos internamente fijada. Creo que es importante, ya que son 6 meses de trabajo que ellos cuentan y nosotros no tuvimos. | Without the first extension, the project would have ended in January 2021. The first extension is important as well. |  |
| 44 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | 6 months, please refer to my previous comment on project start date/end date | Refer to the answer to comment 42 |  |
| 45 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | 4 month extension mainly to develop dissemination activities. Please refer to the extension request documentation | Refer to the answer to comment 42 |  |
| 46 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | Acá no habría que decir que la solicitud es de 4 meses??  Y también habría que mencionar que se justifica por la ola de contagios de COVID que se dio en Uruguay en este primer semester de 2021. |  | Added **(4 months)** |
| 47 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | Ya llevamos como 60  Y no habría que mencionar las reuniones de la Junta del Proyecto??? | Ese número venia del ultimo avance del NAP (el tercero).  No menciono la Junta del Proyecto porque está a cargo del Proyecto. Su participación es implícita | **50** changed into **60** |
| 48 | 4.2.a. Adaptive Management – p 13 | Is this an “evento”? Should this be a separate bullet? Or does it refer to the previous bullet? | This is a “typo” | I removed the bullet point |
| 49 | 4.2.c. Project Finance | Destacar este balance en qué momento fue. Sugiero utilizar los valores al momento de la evaluación (sugiero usar los valores enviados al GCF al momento de la solicitud de extensión, solicitar a Florencia) | Florencia | Added  **The following table shows the project budget included in the request for no-cost extension submitted to the donor in May 2021, i.e. during the evaluation exercise.** |
| 50 | 4.2.c. Project Finance – p 14 | This change was approved by the donor as per the rules for the 6 month COVID 19 extension | I wrote that the evaluation consider the change justified. There is no need to say that it was approved by the donor. The donor knows it. I am not in charge of an audit. However, I added it. | Added ”**, which was approved by the donor as per the rules for the 6 month COVID 19 extension.** |
| 51 | 4.2.d. Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E – p 14 | Please refer to previous comment on this matter | The M&E is not articulated. It is a statement not a judgement. It is not meant to measure/track “changes” or “effects” attributable to the project implementation. It is just about following the implementation of activities. And it is fine. |  |
| 52 | 4.2.d. Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E – p 14 | Tambien reportamos anualmente a PNUD. No sé si es relevante incluirlo. Consultar con Magda.  Si, por favor incluir también los informes anuales realizados en el formato de informe anual de UNDP Uruguay que luego se presenta a la Junta de Proyecto para su revisión. | No había recibidos estos informes durante la fase de trabajo. He trabajado con el ProDoc y los informes anuales para el donante. | Added **and yearly to the UNDP Country Office** |
| 53 | 4.2.d. Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E – p 14 | Mencionar también reuniones de la Junta de Proyecto (disponibles las minutas y presentaciones realizadas) | La Junta de Proyecto es mencionada en el apartado sucesivo 4.2.e. |  |
| 54 | 4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight , Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution – p 14 | Sugiero incluir algún comentario sobre la función de implementation/oversight por parte de la CO y regional office |  | Added **The UNDP CO Team was in constant communication with the Project Team and supported the smooth implementation of activities with all the administration, financial planning and procurement work. The UNDP CO Team also provided a valid support for the general orientation of project activities. Whereas the UNDP Regional Office supported the Project Team by ensuring the compliance with quality criteria of project reporting to the Donor.** |
| 55 | 4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight , Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution – p 15 | Acá faltan instituciones que integran el Sistema Público de Vivienda y que también están integradas al CT:  - Programa de Mejoramiento de Barrios,  - MEVIR,  - Agencia Nacional de Vivienda. |  | **Included** |
| 55 | 4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight , Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution – p 15 | Acá falta la Dirección Nacional de Medio Ambiente de antes que ahora es la Dirección Nacional de Gestión Ambiental |  | **Included** |
| 56 | 4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight , Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution – p 15 | Please specify what you mean by “work”: “technical assistance”, “Oversight”? | The project is implemented by UNDP in all its aspects. Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) | Added **in terms of project management** |
| 57 | 4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight , Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution – p 15 | You introduce 4 elements but then only have 3 bullets. | **It is a typo. Corrected** | **four** changed into **three** |
| 58 | 4.3.b. Relevance – p 19 | Revisar redacción. No se entiende. Tal vez es pertinente mencionar que la división del ministerio se debió al cambio de gobierno? | El periodo es largo, pero me parece que se entienda. Lo he escrito nuevamente utilizando solo los acrónimos que ya son reportado en el informe | **The Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente (MVOTMA), later split, in July into two ministries (2020), i.e. the Ministry of Environment (Ministerio de Ambiente, MoA) and Ministry of Housing and Land Use Planning (Ministerio de Vivienda y Ordenamiento Territorial, MVOT), led the process together with UNDP to formulate the project to ensure the alignment to their institutional needs and strategies.**  changed into  **The MVOTMA, split into two ministries (July 2020), i.e. MOA and MVOT, led the process together with UNDP of the formulation the project to ensure the alignment to their institutional needs and strategies.** |
| 58 | 4.3.b. Relevance – p 19 | este Director Nacional no participó en la evaluación | No participó es verdad. Acá no hablo de quien participó a la evaluación. Entiendo el comentario simplemente como una nota a texto. |  |
| 59 | 4.3.c. effectiveness – p 20 | CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento) | Me habían comunicado el BID. | **Cambiado** |
| 60 | 4.3.c. effectiveness – p 21 | También se podría nombrar la experiencia con la Intendencia de Montevideo, que se encuentra desarrollando su Plan de Acción Climática, que integrará las medidas de adaptación a su PAC.  Agree. NAP Cities has supported Intendencia de Montevideo to elaborate a roadmap for it Climate Action Plan |  | Added  **The Intendencia de Montevideo is as well developing its own Plan de Acción Climática (Climate Action Plan), which will integrate adaptation measures.** |
| 61 | 4.3.c. effectiveness – p 21 | Acá se podrían nombrar también otros acuerdos con el sector académico: Facultad de Agronomía, Juan Lacaze y CENUR.  También los 2 nuevos convenios con Facultad de Ingeniería. | No. Porque no los entrevisté y por lo tanto no sé si y como el Proyecto ha tenido un impacto para su trabajo |  |
| 62 | 4.3.c. effectiveness – p 21 | No entiendo esto….  De acuerdo, creo que fue una confusión. El proyecto sí tuvo un impacto. | No me han reportado ningún impacto para su trabajo y conocimiento. Al vincularse con el proyecto, la Facultad de Ciencias ha aplicado ha aplicado sus saberes. |  |
| 63 | 4.3.e. Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, overall likelihood of sustainability – p 23 | Acá se podría poner el ejemplo de que en el recientemente aprobado Plan Quinquenal de Viviendas, quedó la adaptación como una de las acciones priorizadas. |  | Added **On the contrary, the recently approved Plan Quinquenal de Viviendas (Five-year Housing Plan), which includes the adaptation as a priority action, is a promising sign for the sustainability of the project.** |
| 64 | 4.3.f. Country ownership – p 24 | Yo mencionaría acá también la LOTDS  Nº18.308 de 2008 |  |  |
| 65 | 4.3.i. Catalytic/Replication Effect – p 25 | Creo que acá también hay que poner en relevancia los productos que quedarán más allá del documento del NAP, Guías técnicas, publicaciones, etc. |  | Added **Other documents and publications, such as the technical guidelines produced in the frame of the project are as well are complementary tools, which will help the efforts to move on with the convention in Uruguay.** |
| 66 | 4.3.j. Progress to Impact – p 25 | En línea con el anterior comentario de Myrna. Creo que pondría deliverables produced. Aparte del documento final del plan, hay otros entregables importantes. | Actually it was a typo | **deliverable** change into **delieverables** |
| 67 | 5.1. Main findings – p 26 | Since this will be shared with the GCF, we need to make reference to the approved proposal. The GCF has not seen the prodoc, nor they have to as it is a UNDP requirement only. | Done |  |
| 68 | 5.1. Main findings – p 26 | Mismo comentario que en Pag.14. Es pertinente incluir que también reportamos anualmente a PNUD? |  | Added **and yearly to the UNDP Country Office** |
| 69 | 5.1. Main findings – p 26 | Tal vez también habría que mencionar el ámbito del SNRCC, sobre todo hacia otras instituciones públicas pertenecientes al Gobierno Nacional, ejemplo el MIEM. |  | Added **The project also foresaw an active involvement of the SNRCC and other public institutions belonging to the National Government, such as the MIEM and the OPP.** |
| 70 | 5.2. Conclusions – p 27 | Instituciones del Gobierno Nacional: OPP, SINAE, etc. |  | Added **institutions of the national government** |
| 71 | 5.2. Conclusions – p 27 | Sector privado??? | No tengo evidencias sólidas para el sector privado. |  |
| 72 | 5.2. Conclusions – p 27 | No se entiende |  | **All stakeholders interviewed on the matter reported that this characteristic, for the intensity of occasions of dialogue, represented an element of novelty in Uruguay.**  changed into  **All persons interviewed on the matter reported that this characteristic (i.e. the open and articulated dialogue between project stakeholders), for the intensity of the opportunities of discussion and participation, represented an element of novelty in Uruguay.** |
| 73 | 5.2. Conclusions – p 28 | Sugiero revisar redacción |  | **In order to generate effective capacity development effects and promote country ownership, lessons n° 1 and n° 2 may be applied to UNDP projects that have a component related to the formulation of planning and regulatory documents or tool as capacity development support to the country**  changed into  **Lessons learned n° 1 and n° 2 may be applied to UNDP projects that include, amongst their outputs, the formulation of planning and regulatory documents or tool. Their application generates capacity development effects and promotes country ownership.**  The formulation of the recommendation has been changed as well in the executive summary |
| 74 | 5.2. Conclusions – p 28 | Revisar redacción. No se entiende. | Refer to answer to comment 73 |  |