

Green and Inclusive Recovery in Mexico (GreenMex): Making high-value ecosystems and rural livelihoods more resilient and sustainable in a post COVID-19 scenario.

Basic Information

GEF ID

10717

Countries

Mexico

Project Title

Green and Inclusive Recovery in Mexico (GreenMex): Making high-value ecosystems and rural livelihoods more resilient and sustainable in a post COVID-19 scenario.

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 690083

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

10/1/2020

No. BD 1-5 is a special project and should not be used in Table A. Please reallocate this under BD 1-1.

The objective should be edited. It currently says: **Project Objective:** To mainstream biodiversity conservation, integrated landscape management and ecosystem connectivity into social policies and programmes in Mexico through a Building Back Better approach.

It should say: **Project Objective:** To mainstream biodiversity conservation, integrated landscape management and ecosystem connectivity into social policies and programmes in Mexico. There is no need to add the means to an end in an objective.

Please revise here and in the PIF document itself.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

As requested, objective BD 1-5 has been deleted and funds have been reallocated under BD 1-1.

The project objective has been also changed in Table B and the PIF, as requested.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

10/1/2020

Yes for the most part. Please clarify why the type of private sector "investment mobilized" (\$12 million) is categorized as "other" as opposed to an actual category.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

Please see the change made in Table C from “other” to “loan”. Loans will be provided by the social banking institutions.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

art 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

10/1/2020

Yes for the most part.

Please include from the annex the specific threat identification and description of the three targeted landscapes of the GEF project.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

The specific threat identification and description of the three targeted landscapes have been included in section 1) *the global environmental problem - Project target landscapes and threats* of the revised PIF as requested.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

10/1/2020

The alternative scenario adequately explains how the GEF investment will help green an existing Government program; however it fails to clearly demonstrate how this will lead to the generation of global environmental benefits in the breadth of the entire program (or 20% of the program) as indicated in component one, or in the three targeted landscapes (Montes Azules, Huasteca and Durango landscapes) as indicated in component two and component three. In the description of the alternative please provide a more specific discussion of the circumstances and alternative scenarios in each of the three landscapes vis a vis components two and three and the alternative scenario. Some of this text is in Annex A but the PIF would benefit from having this come earlier in the presentation of the project's intervention logic.

Under outcome 1, Please clarify why only 20% of the SV programs will implement environmentally friendly territorial plans. Shouldn't it be a much higher percentage given that this is a primary objective of the project. Please provide an explanation of why this target is so low.

Under outcome 2 for NbS and outcome three, please link these elements to the three targeted landscapes where they will be implemented. As currently presented these components and outcomes are too academic, and there is no evidence presented that the greater than 3 million hectares impacted are areas of global importance for biodiversity. Related to this observation is the fact that it is not clear from the maps, where in each of the three landscapes the project will intervene. Please either provide a better key to explain each map or draw on the map the physical location of the intervention sites for this project.

While the description of the alternative scenario is very clear, the ToC and the overall presentation of the alternative scenario does not provide a cohesive narrative on how these the project components in combination will reduce threats to globally important biodiversity in the three targeted landscapes and across the entire breadth of the SV program. Please revise accordingly.

It also not clear how the project will ensure that these actions are in fact taking place in areas that are globally important for biodiversity such that the mainstreaming investments into the Government program will generate biodiversity benefits. Please either clarify this in writing or with additional text to accompany the maps, drawing these intervention areas on the maps themselves, and/or in the text describing the three target landscapes.

The ToC diagram is simply a presentation of the results framework. A ToC diagram should show a coherent and logical causal model that includes explicit mention of the assumptions that underpin the causal pathways as this is an essential element to understanding the project hypothesis. Please refer to the STAP publication as a reference for different approaches to the visual presentation of a ToC:

<https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>.

Please strengthen the written description of the alternative scenario by paying special attention to describing the causal pathways that lead to the achievement of the expected outcomes and the underlying assumptions of the causal pathways. For the PIF, you can present these pathways at the level of the SV program and the target landscapes. Documenting these assumptions now will enable a better PPG design process and eventual evaluation of the project intervention strategy at mid-term for course correction if needed and at final evaluation when lessons can be extracted.

Once you have more clearly identified these causal pathways please provide a more robust justification that these pathways are sufficient to achieve the project objectives, given the assumptions upon which they are based and given the problem description that was presented earlier in the PIF and the threats presented later in the PIF that are specific to each target landscape.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

a) The generation of GEBs will be measured in the three targeted landscapes. Please see Table 1 inserted in section 6) *global environmental benefits (GEFTF)* of the revised PIF. The casual pathway is now explicit in the revised TOC diagram and description. Please refer to section 3) the *Alternative scenario*.

b) Section 3 *The Alternative scenario* has been strengthened, as requested. It now includes the problem description of each landscape and the alternatives proposed by Components 2 and 3.

In addition, Section 1) *the global environmental problem ...* has been revised and now comprises a thorough description of the three targeted landscapes, their problems and potential to deliver global environmental benefits. Section 3 is in dialogue with Section 1.

c) The target of Project Indicator 1 will be confirmed during PPG. A footnote has been added in Table B explaining that 20% is a conservative figure and will be re-visited in consultation with key institutions. By the time this GEF project is expected to start its implementation phase, the whole sites of SV will have been reached by the SV Program. Project Indicator 1 aims to improve the territorial management of 20% of SV sites. If this 20% will prove to be economically, socially and environmentally sustainable and durable, the SV Program will scale up the proposed GEF project actions. Output 1.1.3 is aimed to generate objective evidence base for SV decision-makers in Mexico.

d) A description of NBS actions by targeted landscape has been included under Outcome 2.1 and 3.2. Kindly refer to section 3) the *Alternative scenario*.

e) A detailed description of the selection criteria of the project intervention landscapes has been included under section 1) *The global environmental problem..* (see *Project targeted landscapes and threats*). Strong evidence that the greater than 3 million hectares impacted are areas of global importance for biodiversity has been included.

f) The maps are now included in the PIF body and have been improved, as requested. Please see changes in Section 1) *The global environmental problem..* (see *Project targeted landscapes and threats*).

g) The TOC diagram has been improved and a TOC description has been included, as requested. The alternative scenario has also been revised. Kindly see Section 3) the *Alternative scenario*. The TOC will be further discussed with project stakeholders during PPG.

h) The project intervention areas and their importance for global biodiversity have been described in the revised Section 1) *The global environmental problem..* (see *Project targeted landscapes and threats*). Maps have been amended as well.

i) The TOC diagram has been revised, and now includes the project assumptions. A TOC description has been included, explaining how the pathway will apply to both the SV Program level and the three targeted landscapes. Kindly see Section 3) the *Alternative scenario*

j) The written description of the alternative scenario has been improved, by providing a detailed narrative of the problems at landscape levels (section 1) and how the problems are related to the proposed project TOC and actions at field level (see description of Outcomes and Outputs, section 3). The causal pathway is applicable to both the SV Program level (Component 1) and the landscape levels (Component 2 and 3). The TOC and alternative scenario will be further discussed and refined during PPG. Kindly see Section 3) the *Alternative scenario*

k) The assumptions, project outcomes and project objective, and their inter-relations have been illustrated in the revised TOC and TOC description, as well as in the alternative scenario narrative. Kindly see Section 3) the *Alternative scenario*

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

No, as noted above this does not align with BD 1-5. Please revise.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

BD 1-5 has been deleted from Table A.

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

10/1/2020

No. Once the alternative scenario is revised per instructions above then revise the incremental reasoning section to reflect that revision and be sure to address the incremental reasoning at the program level of SV and at the site level in the three target landscapes.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

The incremental reasoning has been adjusted indicating that the thorough description of the SV Program and targeted landscapes *vis-à-vis* the baseline scenario has been developed in Section 3, i.e. Components and Outcomes description, TOC diagram and description. Project components will address baseline barriers as described in the *Incremental Reasoning* section. Barriers have been included in the revised TOC diagram.

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

10/1/2020

Yes, for the most part. Please clarify in the PIF the area of each target landscape that is contributing to the total indicator number for each core indicator.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

Please see Table 1: *Project expected GEBs, disaggregated by landscape*, that has been added in Section 6 *Global environmental benefits*..

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. In the maps of the targeted landscapes please more clearly delineate the geographic area where GEF will invest to demonstrate that these geographies are indeed areas of global importance and/or are located nearby areas of global significance for biodiversity so that the threat reduction strategy proposed is justified for generating global biodiversity benefits.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

Maps have been amended and the explanation of why the selected landscapes are important for global biodiversity has been broadened. Kindly see Section 1) *The global environmental problem.. (see Project targeted landscapes and threats).*

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Please include any summary of stakeholder consultations that have taken place to date.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2020

A summary of the stakeholder consultations has been included in Section 2) *Stakeholders*, as requested.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

10/1/2020

Yes, and this includes adequate consideration of COVID-19 risks.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

art 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

10/1/2020

Please include the revised endorsement letter required.

10/22/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22 2020

~~SECRET 22, 2020~~

The revised LOE is included in this PIF re-submission.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/1/2020

NA.

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

10/1/2020

Please make the suggested revisions above and resubmit the proposal.

10/22/2020

The PIF is being recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/1/2020	10/22/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The GreenMex project will mainstream biodiversity conservation, integrated landscape management and ecosystem connectivity into social

policies and programs in Mexico. To achieve this objective, the project will build on the **Sembrando Vida Program (SV)**, the flagship social program aiming to reduce poverty of agricultural households living in (or adjacent to) areas with forest restoration potential. SV functions as an economic incentive for poor families to adopt more sustainable practices in agroforestry and create community-based businesses by providing regular monthly payments, access to financial services and extension services and training to farmers.

The proposed GEF project will be implemented in forest/agroforest landscapes within three target areas. The selection criterion is a confluence of government actions such as the SV and the CONAFOR, CONANP and SEMARNAT programs. The GEF project will implement actions focused on: i) strengthening stakeholders' capacities for the recognition, valuation and sustainable management of biodiversity and ecosystem services; ii) mainstreaming environmental criteria in the SV Program; iii) strengthening territorial governance to improve social representation in decision-making processes; iv) implementing agroforestry systems that rescue ancestral practices while adopting new knowledge and practices; v) promoting ecosystem connectivity through landscape restoration, reforestation and community-based forestry management; and vi) developing market-based tools to promote the inclusive participation of SV beneficiaries in the value-chain of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and underutilized native species (with emphasis on women, youth and indigenous people).

The global environmental benefits that will be produced by the proposed project include: (i) 3,813,160 ha will benefit from the expected regulatory and policy changes to be achieved through the project in key sectors; (ii) 100,000 ha of terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; (iii) 133,325 ha of area of land restored (degraded agricultural land restored: 58,115 ha/ area of forest and forest land restored: 75,210 ha).