

Agriculture and Biodiversity in Mexico (AgribioMex): Mainstreaming biodiversity in the productive activities of rural landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10574

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

Agriculture and Biodiversity in Mexico (AgribioMex): Mainstreaming biodiversity in the productive activities of rural landscapes

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

9/19/2022

Review completed by PM

4/4/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. 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

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. 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

10/3/2022

Please provide cofinancing for the PMC that is proportional to the overall cofinancing ratio for the project. Currently PMC cofinance is zero.

12/10/2022

Co-financing: Ministry of Economy - change ?Investment mobilized? to ?Recurrent expenditures

On the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 2.7%, for a co-financing of \$74,353,312 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,07,539 instead of \$1,410,000 (which is 1.8%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

	Sub Total (\$)	8,731,446.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ		
	GET	242,866.00
	Sub Total(\$)	242,866.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	8,974,312.00

Agency Response

21/03/2023

Done (see PRODOC page 85, CEO Endorsement page 8).

Thanks for clarifying. GEF contribution and co-financing contribution to the PMC are now proportional:

- ? GEF: $\$425,517 / \$8,548,795 = 4.97\%$
- ? Co-financing: $\$3,600,904 / \$72,162,408 = 4.98\%$

Please see CEO Endorsement page 2-7.

09/11/2022

PMC cofinancing amount has been increased to US\$1,410,000. This has been obtained by subtracting from Components 1, 2 and 3 US\$470,000, allowing to keep the total cofinancing unaltered at US\$75,763,312.

Original GEF amount for PMC has been maintained at US\$242,866.

See Part I, Section B.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/10/2022

Please clarify what Professional Services and Other Direct Costs entails as presented in the PPG report table. Please check the eligible categories of expenditure in the Guidelines.

4/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response
21/03/2023

Professional Services:

The below information comes from the "Objectives" section within the Terms of Reference from the 6 individual sub-contracts between CI Mexico and third party specialists who carried out the work for the PPG. These contracts are internal documents of CI.

Contract	Description	Objective	Obligated Amount USD
6006832	GEF project manager for the PPG phase	Lead the preparation and approval of the ProDoc PPG package (ProDoc with all annexes, co-financing letters and CEO Endorsement template) by securing a technically and financially sound documents with the highest social and environmental standards, an inclusive approach, the effective oversight of consultants' deliverables, and securing a close communication and coordination between CI-GEF, CIMX and SADER with the Project Partners, government institutions and local stakeholders.	56,160.48
6007064	Specialist in preparation and drafting of GEF documents	The objective of this consultancy is the development of the "Project Document" (ProDoc) of the GEF 7 project "Mainstreaming biodiversity across the agriculture sector in six priority rural landscapes" in the CI GEF Implementing Agency format in English language, including all required annexes as part of the project proposal and project endorsement format.	26,809.87
6007065	GEF-GIS baseline expert	The overall objective of this consultancy is to collect information, especially from the National Agrifood and Fisheries Information System (SIAP) and the geographic information system (GIS) of the National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR) to build a geospatial database for the selected landscapes in the project. - Monthly mapping progress reports for each selected landscape and the mapping system as a whole. - Database for each selected landscape and dynamic and manageable cartography through PDF or similar format viewers. - The specialist may have field trips to participate in the consolidation of intervention sites.	27,615.58
6007068	Technical/Administrative Specialist and facilitator of GEF workshops	The overall objective of this consultancy is to provide strategic support to the full proposal preparation phase (PPG) of the GEF 7 project. proposal (PPG) preparation phase of the GEF 7 project. agreements, accounting support, management of formalities and payments, etc.	20,409.03
6007338	Territorial management and links specialist	Specialist with previous experience in the project, who knows the key actors with whom negotiations must be carried out, and will also provide support to close various agreements and establish MOU's prior to implementation.	14,920.68
6007411	Animated video production for consultation process	"The general objective of this consultancy is to inform potential allies in the territory about the basic concepts of the project using an animated and didactic video format to facilitate understanding and promote participation in virtual and/or face-to-face meetings to learn more about the project.	10,307.18
			156,222.82

Other Direct Costs:

Country program administrative expenses supporting the program's activities which are difficult to attribute to a specific project, such as rent, electricity or administrative support staff.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Please ensure that all Core Indicators are properly identified in the project logframe. A few are entered, but not all of them.

11/23/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

09/11/2022

GEF7 Core indicators included in Table E have been duly flagged/reflected in the project logframe as follows:

- GEF3 already included in the logframe
- GEF4 already included in the logframe
- GEF6 has been added in the logframe
- GEF11 has been flagged in the logframe

See Annex A.

See also PRODOC Appendix I and Appendix III

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

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

1. It is noted that project has attached a Stakeholder Engagement plan in Annex I. This annex includes mainly information and analysis of stakeholders but does not clearly outline a plan for stakeholder engagement in project implementation, including means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities. In addition, the submission references Annex J ? a Free and Prior Informed Consent Plan for indigenous peoples. It seems that this Annex has not been uploaded. Please upload and clarify.

4/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

21/03/2023

Annex I has been reformulated and clearly outlines a plan for stakeholder engagement in project implementation, including means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities.

With regard to the Free Prior and Informed Consent, it has been uploaded, see Annex J in the CEO Endorsement and Annex 1 of the PRODOC. The Annex has also been shared offline with the GEF programme manager who provided his clearance.

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

12/20/2022

It is noted that the Gender Policy and Gender Plan are attached. Agency is however requested to provide a summary of its gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment under *Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* as per usual practice. Agency is also requested to indicate/include under Output 4.1.1, the monitoring and evaluation of its Gender Plan.

4/13/2023

-The comment on gender was partly addressed. Reference to M&E of gender action plan (Output 4.1.1) was made. However, the agency did not provide a summary of its gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment under Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, as requested. Please provide this summary in the portal, as per usual practice.

4/18/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

17/04/2023

done

21/03/2023

A summary of the gender analysis has been included under Section 3 of the PRODOC, specifically under the sub-section P - Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (see Prodoc para 191-195). Under output 4.1.1 it has been specified that the M&E system will also allow to monitor and evaluate the GAP (see PRODOC Appendix III; CEO endorsement Part II, Section 8, para 100).

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

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 CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/10/2022

We note that 4 vehicles are identified for purchase, and these expenditures are approved.

However, please address these issues:

1. The budget table under Annex E and the Portal entry's table B do show some differences between components as following:

- Component 1 in Budget table: \$1,558,676	- Component 1 in Table B:
\$1,486,357	
- Component 2 in Budget table: \$4,442,776	- Component 2 in Table B:
\$4,222,898	
- Component 3 in Budget table: \$2,279,953	- Component 3 in Table B:
\$2,063,691	
- Component 4 in Budget table: \$0	- Component 4 in Table B:
\$952,500	
- M&E in Budget table: \$265,513	- M&E in Table B: \$0
- PMC in Budget table: \$427,304	- PMC in Table B: \$242,866

Financial Statements Audit should not be included under the M&E budget but under PMC, please correct the M&E budget table accordingly, also please include a total row for the M&E budget under section 9 ? M&E of the CEO endorsement entry.

BUDGET TABLE COMMENTS:

1. Please include the responsible entity for each budget line accordingly.
2. Please upload an excel version of the budget to Portal.
3. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution should be charged to the GEF and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC but not to project components ? this includes the project?s staff, which for this project seems to be Vice President (is this IFAD?s staff?), Operations Director, Project Director, Administrative Assistant. Please note that there is room to increase the PMC up to 5.0% to cover these positions (in which case, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC has to be increased proportionally ? see comment 1 above) ? with this, there will be enough fund to cover the project?s staff.
4. Office operating costs and Bank fees should be charged to PMC but not to project components.
5. Please explain what does Indirect Costs @8% cover? Is this some type of fee for the executing entity? Please kindly note that such fee for executing entity cannot be covered with GEF resources but with co-financing resources - all admin costs incurred by executing entity should be charged to PMC and within the allowed threshold in the Guidelines of the GEF Project Cycle Policy.

4/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

21/03/2023

Noted with thanks.

1. Budget has been harmonized throughout the documents, in particular: PRODOC page 26 (Table 13), page 81 (Table 27), page 82 (Table 28) and Detailed Project Budget page 129 (Appendix VII) are harmonized with the table on page 2 under section B of the CEO endorsement.

Financial statement audits have been removed from the M&E budget and included in the PMC. The total for the M&E budget has been included under section 9 of the CEO Endorsement and in the PRODOC (see page 80, table 26).

1. The responsible entity has been included for each budget line (see PRODOC, Appendix VII; see excel uploaded in the Portal).

2. The excel version of the budget has been uploaded in the Portal.

3. Vice president is CI Mexico staff. Position is now covered under PMC.

Project Director is still charged to project Components because The Project Director (PD) is a new full-time senior level position exclusively dedicated to the project and is responsible for ensuring the achievement of objectives and results in the project. (See updated Terms of Reference for Key Project Positions, Director, Project GEF7).

The Administrative Assistant is still charged to project Components because it is a new hire exclusively dedicated to the project and will directly support the achievement of project outcomes through project administration and finance (See updated Terms of Reference for Key Project Positions, Administrative Assistant)

4. Office operating costs and Bank fees have been charged to PMC.

5. Indirect Costs @8% has been removed and these funds were reallocated to project components to cover concepts that were omitted from the previous version, but are nevertheless crucial to the successful implementation of the project including:

- a. Social and Environmental Safeguards (75%)
- b. Security (20%)

c. Grants and Contracts (5%)

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

As noted above under the Core Indicators, please ensure that all GEF core indicators are clearly identified in the project logframe.

11/23/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

09/11/2022

GEF7 Core indicators included in Table E have been duly flagged/reflected in the project logframe as follows:

- GEF3 already included in the logframe
- GEF4 already included in the logframe
- GEF6 has been added in the logframe
- GEF11 has been flagged in the logframe

See Annex A.

See also PRODOC Appendix I and Appendix III.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Please review the comments made by the UK and Norway and provide a response, building on the original response provided by the original GEF agency in the case of the UK comments.

11/23/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

09/11/2022

Responses to the comments made by UK and Norway have been provided. In the case of the UK comments, responses build on the original response provided by the original GEF agency.

See Annex B.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Comprehensive response to STAP comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/3/2022

Please respond to issues identified above and resubmit.

12/10/2022

No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.

4/13/2023

Please address the issue related to gender above and include the requested text. This is the only remaining issue.

4/18/2023

Yes all issues have been addressed, cleared.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/3/2022	11/11/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/23/2022	3/24/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/10/2022	4/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/18/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project objective is to mainstream biodiversity in rural landscapes by implementing sustainable policies and practices in the agriculture sector in six rural landscapes in Mexico: 1) Northwestern, state of Sonora; 2) North Pacific, states of Jalisco and Nayarit; 3) Northeastern, states of San Luis Potosi, Tamaulipas, and Nuevo Leon; 4) Central, Mexico City, State of Mexico, and Morelos; 5) South Pacific, states of Guerrero and Oaxaca; and 6) Southeastern, states of Chiapas, Oaxaca, and Veracruz. The selected landscapes have a high biodiversity value, but they lack regulations for protecting biodiversity, and the natural resources in these areas are under considerable human pressure. Project landscapes include diverse ecosystems, such as dry grasslands, pine and oak forests, and tropical dry and humid forests.

The project will be executed through three components, building on existing government agricultural development programs, to achieve three key outcomes: 1) Policies and regulations of the agriculture sector incorporate biodiversity and sustainable land use considerations; 2) Land use plans and extension programs incorporate biodiversity management and sustainable land use practices; and 3) Blended finance mechanisms in the agriculture sector include biodiversity and sustainable land use criteria.

The six landscapes comprise approximately 8.1 million hectares, of which 3.6 million hectares are Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs) Within the 3.6 million hectares of PBAs, the project will promote three types of interventions:

- Direct impact: best practices implemented in 889,106 hectares for improved management for biodiversity conservation.

- Direct impact: restoration (active and passive) in 63,000 hectares to contribute to Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN).

- Indirect impact in the landscapes: public programs and incentives (at least in the Fertilizers and Production for Wellbeing Programs), by requiring that the incentives provided by these two programs in the rural landscapes apply biodiversity criteria, impacting 2.6 million hectares with some agricultural activity distributed in the six rural landscapes.