

Ecosystem restoration and sustainable livelihoods in the Biocultural Corridor of the Central West of Mexico (COBIOCOM)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11249

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

Ecosystem restoration and sustainable livelihoods in the Biocultural Corridor of the Central West of Mexico (COBIOCOM)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

4/30/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

a) Yes, cleared.

b) For "Project Sector (CCM Only):", please complete with "AFOLU".

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

b) Done

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Please include the expected GEBs and complete the last sentence "The project will be delivered through 4 components" which is not finished.

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

- The expected GEBs have been included.

- We have completed the last sentence and included the information about components. There are 5 components (not four): 1. Regional governance, cross-sectoral multi-scale planning, and multi-stakeholder engagement; 2. Integrated landscape management; 3. Innovative financial mechanisms and incentive schemes bringing impactful investments to scale; 4. Capacity building and knowledge management and 5. Project M&E.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

a) Please complete the project overall objective with the targeted area: Biocultural Corridor of Western Mexico (COBIOCOM).

b)

b.1. Please move the text of the reference notes below the table as putting these notes together with the outputs within the table makes the table format much longer and the reading more difficult.

b.2. Project indicators and targets would be very welcome for component 3 as well (as they are already for component 1 and 2). Please consider adding such indicators and targets.

May 16, 2023:

a) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the amendments and additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

a. Done

b.1. Done. The text of the footnotes has been placed below the table.

b.2. Done.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023

On gender consideration, please incorporate gender perspectives in Outcome 1.1 especially on land-use planning models / updated land use policies; Output 3.1.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 should be gender-responsive and consider women as among the beneficiaries; Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2 should be gender-responsive.

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for completing the gender dimension. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

The gender perspective has been mainstreamed in: Outcome 1.1 (outputs: 1.1.2 and 1.1.3); Outcome 1.2 (output 1.1.2 and project indicator 2); Outcome 3.1 (outputs: 3.1.2 and 3.1.4); Outcome 3.2 (outputs 3.2.1 & 3.2.2) and Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

a) Yes, the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC are proportional with 5% and 5.2% respectively. Cleared.

b) Yes, the PMC is equal to 5% of the total GEF grant. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

April 29, 2023

a)

a.1. The period of reference for the deforestation data is 2001-2018. This long period doesn't necessarily reflect the current or most recent reality. Please add more recent data of deforestation in the targeted states or landscape (COBIOCOM).

a.2. Please correct the typo "COBICOM".

a.3. The description is not clear about the status of the lands where deforestation and land degradation occur. Are these lands PAs, public or private lands? What is the current regulatory framework of these lands protecting them or eventually allowing their use for agriculture? Please clarify this aspect as it has consequences to justify the proposed activities.

b) Yes, cleared.

May 16, 2023:

a) Thank you for the consideration and additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

a.1. We have included more recent information about deforestation in the COBIOCOM states: 2012-2021 (Global Forest Watch database) and information from CONAFOR (2015-2018) for the state of Jalisco.

a.2. Corrected

a.3. Information on the property status of land in deforested areas has been added to the description of the national context. There are no specific data on % of deforestation under

different land property typology for the project area. However, it is expected to be in line with the data on the national scale.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

April 29, 2023

a) The project approach looks very relevant to address the identified problems and barriers building on the existing baseline (COBIOCOM). Cleared.

b) Yes, the proposed activities (in particular land use planning, restoration, improved governance and development of incentives) should enhance resilience to future changes. Cleared.

c)

c.1. In the baseline initiatives and investments, please briefly explain what COBIOCOM is and how the proposed project will build on and articulate with it.

c.2. Among the baseline initiatives and investments, there is no mention of any GEF funded projects. The GEF has supported or is supporting several projects with similar objectives to reduce deforestation and promote sustainability of productive landscapes. Please explore the possibility of using outcomes of these investments such as at least lessons learned.

d) Yes, cleared.

May 16, 2023:

c) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

c.1. Done. We have explained what COBIOCOM is and how the project is articulated and will build on it.

c.2. At least 3 GEF projects and one GCF project were identified for lessons learned and partnerships.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 29, 2023

a)

a.1. There isn't any narrative of the TOC. We don't see the logic and causal pathways linking the problems and barriers with the solutions and taking into account the assumptions. Please add a brief description of the TOC presenting the key causal pathways underlying the TOC (linking clearly problems, barriers, assumptions, outputs and outcomes).

a.2. Please correct the typo "CONBIOCOM".

b)

b.1. The description of the components only includes the names of the outputs. Please elaborate further on the outputs/activities.

b.2. The stakeholders role is unclear in the description of the outputs. Please clearly present the stakeholders roles to each project output.

May 16, 2023:

a)

a.1. Thank you for including a narrative of the TOC with clear causal pathways. Cleared.

a.2. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

b)

b.1. We only find additional information for the component 4. Nevertheless the information already provided was clear and can be accepted at this stage. Cleared.

b.2 Thank you for the additional information (not provided in the project components as indicated by the Agency in the review sheet but in a separate section "Stakeholders? roles:". Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

a.1. The TOC narrative has been redesigned. We have added a new ToC includes linking clearly problems, barriers, assumptions, outputs and outcomes.

a.2. Corrected

b.1. The description of the components has been elaborated further.

b.2. Done. We have included the role of the main stakeholders in the project components.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 29, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023

a) Yes, the planned institutional arrangement is briefly presented in the section "Project stakeholders and expected beneficiaries". Cleared.

b) The GEF Agency doesn't expect to play any execution role on this project. Cleared.

c) As mentioned above, there is no mention of any GEF funded projects. Please consider other GEF investments and elaborate on potential coordination and cooperation as relevant.

d) While knowledge management is included in component 4, the approach to knowledge management and learning is not clearly described in the Project Description. Please clarify the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and the overall communication strategy/plan of the project. In the response, the Agency may consider addressing the following key GEF KM&L expectations at PIF stage in a bit more detail:

- i. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept
- ii. plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
- iii. processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
- iv. tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
- v. knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)
- vi. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability
- vii. plans for strategic communications and outreach

May 16, 2023:

c) and d) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

c) Related projects are now mentioned in the *Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project* section.

d) the Knowledge Management and Learning component has been revised, as requested.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 29, 2023

a)

a.1. For the sub-indicator 6.1, the duration of accounting should be 20 years (not 10) unless strongly justified. Please amend accordingly or explain.

a.2. Hectares of restored woodlands correspond to the GEF core indicator 3.3 and not 3.3.1 as indicated under the GEF indicators table. Please correct.

b) Yes, cleared.

May 16, 2023:

a.1 Thank you for the consideration. But the new expected result for CI.6 is now very high compared to similar project and budget. The assessment of the climate change mitigation potential will need to be revised during PPG. Cleared.

a.2. The typo is not corrected but it is not critical. It can be changed during PPG. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

a.1. Corrected

a.2. Corrected

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Some risks are unclear, and particularly the following ones: Environment and Social, Macro-economic and Strategies and Policies. For each risk, please clearly present 1- the risk and 2- the mitigation measures.

c) We note that the Agency has attached the ESS screening checklist and Risk certification and an overall ESS risk of the program is classified as moderate. The project will develop an FPIC process in areas with indigenous communities and properties, and Indigenous communities will be identified and targeted into the landscapes selected during PPG stage. Please provide a plan to assess potential impacts on indigenous peoples and develop an engagement plan with indigenous peoples throughout the project during the project design stage. (Comment for 5.6 Risks, c).

May 16, 2023:

b) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

c) Thank you for the uploaded document "Indigenous peoples plan". Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

b. the Risk table has been revised, Now, it includes the risk descriptions and mitigation measures.

c. A preliminary indigenous peoples' plan (to be further developed during PPG) is included in the Section Documents of the GEF Portal.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023

- a) Yes, the project intends to work with different sectors (environment and agriculture) and includes a broad range of stakeholders along value chains. Its articulation with the existing framework of COBIOCOM (which includes 8 states) enhances its potential for sustainability, transformation and scaling-up. Cleared.
- b) Yes, through different ways as presented in the project description and in particular the component 1 on regional governance and the component 3 focussed on promoting innovative financial mechanisms and incentive schemes. Cleared.
- c) Yes, through cross-sectoral multi-scale planning (component 1) and through COBIOCOM's governance, presented as a consortium of subnational governments seeking to improve policy coherence and fostering a mosaic approach. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023

The description clearly identifies which of the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) the project contributes. Nevertheless it doesn't inform how. Please clarify how the project is expected to contribute to the GBF targets.

May 16, 2023:

We take note of the improvement but adding a short narrative instead of just identifying the output numbers contributing to the targets (as it is now) would be much clearer. A more explicit and clearer description is expected during PPG. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

We have detailed how the project outputs will contribute to the GBF targets 1 (through project's outputs 1.1.1; 1.1.2 and 1.2.1), 2 (output 2.1.1), 3 (output 2.1.5), 10 (output 2.1.4), 11 (outputs 2.1.1. and 2.1.3), 19 (outputs 3.1.1; 3.2.1; 3.2.2; and 3.2.3) and 21 (outputs 4.1.1; 4.1.2; and 4.2.2) of the Kunming-Montreal Biodiversity Framework.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

Communities

April 30, 2023

Partially. The proposal says Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and the Private Sector were consulted. However this is not clearly

mentioned in the description. Please provide a list of all the stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including the dates of these consultations.

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Please note that the consultations of IPLCs remain unclear and will need to be further presented during PPG. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

A summary of consultations and dates is now included in the PIF.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023

The Table Sources of Funds in Portal does not match the Sources of Funds allocated in the LoE ? there are two options:

- i. The Agency makes the changes in the Source of Funds table in Portal: the risk is that the submission does not go through because at this juncture, Mexico exhausted the CC and LD allocation.
- ii. The Agency gets a new LoE that matches the Source of Funds table in Portal ? it is the safest route.

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
FAO	GET	Mexico	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	9,075,001.00
FAO	GET	Mexico	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	924,999.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					10,000,000.00

Source of funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GEFT F	FAO	BD STAR Allocation	6,699,315	636,435	150,000	14,250	7,500,000
GEFT F	FAO	LD STAR Allocation	1,518,511	144,259	34,000	3,230	1,700,000
GEFT F	FAO	CC STAR Allocation	714,594	67,886	16,000	1,520	800,000
Total GEF Resources			8,932,420	848,580	200,000	19,000	10,000,000

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for providing a new LoE matching the Sources of Funds table in the Portal. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

A new letter of endorsement from the OFP is uploaded. This LoE matches the sources of funds table in portal

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, the PPG requested is \$200,000, which is allowed for a FSP above \$6 million.
Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023

Regarding the support of "Colima: IMADES", public investment is normally classified as investment mobilized. Please revise the below which is classified as "recurrent expenditures" to "investment mobilized".

Recipient Country Government	Colima: IMADES	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	270,270.00
---------------------------------	----------------	----------------------	---------------------------	------------

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

Corrected

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

April 29, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Partially. The information included in the Taxonomy Worksheet is very limited and only until level 2. Please complete the Taxonomy Worksheet with all the kind of stakeholders, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Gender Equality and Focal Area/Theme (there is not only biodiversity) completing with level 3 information.

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for completing the Taxonomy. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

15 May 2023

The taxonomy worksheet has been updated.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

May 16, 2023:

Yes, the PIF is now recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

May 16, 2023

1. The assessment of the climate change mitigation potential will need to be revised during PPG.
2. The typo of core indicator ?3.3.1? is not corrected but it is not critical. It can be changed during PPG.
3. A more explicit and clearer description on how the project contributes to the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework is expected during PPG.
4. The consultations of IPLCs remain unclear and will need to be further presented during PPG.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/5/2023	5/15/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		