

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Mexico

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10504

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Mexico

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/9/2020

Review completed by PM

4/6/2020

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

NA.

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

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part 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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7 April 2020

The UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) was attached to the re-submission

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

3/9/2020

The projects aims to work in these seven (7) landscapes and seascapes in Mexico –(1) Forest and milpa landscape in Quintana Roo, Yucatan and Campeche States, (2) Sustainable forestry landscape in Quintana Roo, Campeche and Yucatan, (3) Coastal seascape in the Yucatan Peninsula, (4) Agroforestry landscape in Chiapas and Tabasco, (5) Usumacinta and Grijalva rivers watershed, (6) Mixteca Landscape, and) (7) Oaxaca Mountain Landscape.

Mexico's GEF-7 portfolio aims to work in many of these same landscapes, with many of the same stakeholders, implementing many of the same kinds of activities. Please clarify what is the mechanism to ensure complementarity between the SGP investments and the FSP projects that are under development and/or implementation to avoid duplication in investments in these landscapes. As currently presented, it appears there is no such national mechanism in place.

3/23/2020

Adequate clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/23/2020

The PIF has been amended to include the following text on page 39:

The Government of Mexico, through the Political and Operational Focal Points, SHCP (Ministry of Finance and Public Credit) and SEMARNAT (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources), as the leader of the environmental sector, have established a constant communication channel to promote interaction between proponents, including SGP, and from this, promote synergies and avoid overlaps on the ground.

For the Seventh Operational Phase of the SGP, SEMARNAT has promoted specific meetings between the National Coordination of the SGP and high-level officials in charge of designing the proposals that will eventually be included in the National GEF-7 portfolio. Information has been exchanged in order to guarantee that projects are complementary and avoid double counting of the co-financing resources.

In summary, strategic partnerships have been promoted at the highest level to enhance the impact of concurrent projects in different regions, in accordance with the Federal decision to support vulnerable areas and groups, promoting sustainable development in the southeast of the country. Likewise, both SHCP and SEMARNAT are part of the National Steering Committee of the SGP, thus through the decision-making and PPG stage, complementarity actions and constant monitoring of actions will be determined to avoid duplication of investments and secure the most efficient application of GEF resources.

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

3/9/2020

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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part 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

3/9/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

3/9/2020

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC 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

3/9/2020

No. Please clarify issues above and resubmit.

3/23/2020

No. The PIF shows that some environmental and social risks screening has taken place, but UNDP should be able to, at this stage, submit the prescreening report of the project if it is available. This report should include the overall environmental and social risks rating of the project including information on the types and levels of risk identified. Please include the risk report as an Annex to the submission and resubmit.

4/7/2020

Yes the project is recommended for CEO technical 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		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

	PIF Review	Agency Response
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 objective of the SGP in Mexico is to strengthen socio-ecological and economic resilience in seven (7) landscapes and seascapes in Mexico –(1) Forest and milpa landscape in Quintana Roo, Yucatan and Campeche States, (2) Sustainable forestry landscape in Quintana Roo, Campeche and Yucatan, (3) Coastal seascape in the Yucatan Peninsula, (4) Agroforestry landscape in Chiapas and Tabasco, (5) Usumacinta and Grijalva rivers watershed, (6) Mixteca Landscape, and) (7) Oaxaca Mountain Landscape). Small grants will support activities in the selected landscapes and seascapes that improve connectivity, support innovation in biodiversity conservation and optimization of ecosystem services. This will include supporting no-take zones to promote sustainable fisheries; agrobiodiversity conservation; wetland and reef restoration; establishment of new community conservation areas and territories, sustainable silvopastoral and agroforestry systems, sustainable forest management, renewable and energy efficient technologies in each landscape, including solar and wind energy applications, micro-hydro generation systems, biodigestors, efficient biomass use and wood stoves. The SGP will coordinate SGP investments in these landscapes with FSP investments being undertaken in the same geographies to ensure complementarity.