

Mexico's Seventh National Communication (7NC) and First Biennial Transparency Report (1BTR) to UNFCCC

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10955

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

Mexico's Seventh National Communication (7NC) and First Biennial Transparency Report (1BTR) to UNFCCC

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

4/4/2022

Review completed by PM

4/25/2022

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 5/10/2022

Cleared.

EBF 5/3/2022

Please address the following comments:

1. Kindly note that UNOPS is not one of the 18 implementing GEF Agencies. Please correct the partner type to 'Other?' under "Executing Partner Type" in "Part I: Project Information"

Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ

UNOPS

Executing Partner Type

GEF Agency

2. Given the 4 week circulation it seems the expected implementation start date will not be possible to meet. Please amend the "Expected Implementation Start" to a future date.

Type of Reports	Submission Date	Expected Implementation Start	Expected Completion Date	Expected Report Submission to Convention
UNFCCC Biennial Transparency Report/ National Communication (BTR/NC)	4/4/2022	6/1/2022	5/31/2025	12/31/2024
Duration ⓘ 36 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 173,516.00		

EBF 4/6/2022

This project is aligned with the GEF-7 climate change focal area strategy.

Agency Response Executing Partner Type and Expected Implementation Start date have been corrected in the portal.

Project description summary

Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/25/2022

Cleared.

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, with suggestions. Please address the following comments:

1. In ?Part I: Project Information?, please fill in who will act as Executing Partner of the project. Right now, it is blank in the Portal.

Agency Response 1. Corrected in the portal.

Co-financing

Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified [and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?]

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Although co-financing is not required for EAs, co-finance has been confirmed for this project and the corresponding co-financing letter has been provided and uploaded in the Portal.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, Table D is properly filled out.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from:

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, the project seeks \$1,326,484 (excluding Agency Fee) from Mexico's STAR allocation.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, this project seeks \$500,000 (excluding Agency Fee) from the CCM set-aside, which is under the maximum funding as the preparation for a combined BTR/NC, as indicated in the information note (GEF/C.59/Inf.19).

Agency Response

Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/25/2022

Cleared.

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes. This is well and clearly described. Just a minor suggestion:

1. The acronym ?GHGI? is explained in the attached prodoc (*?National Inventory of Anthropogenic Emissions of greenhouse gases and compounds?*) but not in the Portal. Could you please explain what it stands for the first time it is mentioned in the Portal?

Agency Response Acronyms have been revised.

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/25/2022

1. Cleared.
2. The Social and Environmental Screening Template is mentioned in the Portal and attached in the document section. Cleared

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, with suggestions. Please address the following comments:

1. Please replace Implementing Partner (UNDP terminology) by Executing Agency (GEF terminology) to avoid confusion. This term appears in Section C (including Figure 1) and Section E. Also, please make sure that the words execution and implementation are used correctly in these sections in accordance with GEF terminology.
2. Information on Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) is not included. Please add the Agency's ESS screening of this project and provide a justification in case this project is excluded from the Agency's ESS procedures.

Agency Response

1. UNDP terminology has been replaced with GEF terminology.
2. SESP information has been added under M&E budget table and has been uploaded as a document.

Stakeholders.

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?

Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender equality and women's empowerment.

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/25/2022

The budget has been corrected and is now consistent with the M&E Plan and Budget section. Cleared.

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, with suggestions. Please address the following comments:

1. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget indicates \$1,000 to cover the Inception Workshop plus \$18,000 for Terminal Evaluation. However, the project budget (file: Others ?PIMS 6683-GEF Budget.xlsx?) only considers \$18,000 for an International Consultant for the Terminal Evaluation. In other words, the budget is \$1,000 shorter than what is stated in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget in the Portal. Please correct accordingly.

Agency Response The budget has been revised to cover \$1,000 for the inception workshop in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget in the Portal.

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

The CCM set-aside portion is under the maximum funding as the preparation for a combined BTR/NC, as indicated in the information note (GEF/C.59/Inf.19).

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 4/6/2022

Yes, the endorsement letter is signed by the OFP of Mexico.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

GEF Secretariat Comment

EBF 4/6/2022

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 4/6/2022
N/A

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 4/6/2022
N/A

Agency Response
STAP Comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 4/6/2022
N/A

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 4/6/2022
N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 4/6/2022
N/A

Agency Response
GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 5/10/2022

Cleared. The PM recommends for CEO Approval.

EBF 5/3/2022

Please address the following comments:

1. Kindly note that UNOPS is not one of the 18 implementing GEF Agencies.
Please correct the partner type to "Other" under "Executing Partner Type" in "Part I: Project Information"
2. Given the 4 week circulation it seems the expected implementation start date will not be possible to meet. Please amend the "Expected Implementation Start" to a future date.

EBF 4/25/2022

The PM recommends the clearance for CEO Approval.

EBF 4/6/2022

Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/6/2022	4/25/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations