

Promoting sustainability in the agave-mezcal value chain through restoration and integrated management of biocultural landscapes in Oaxaca

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10869

Countries

Mexico

Project Name

Promoting sustainability in the agave-mezcal value chain through restoration and integrated management of biocultural landscapes in Oaxaca

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/9/2022

Review completed by PM

1/31/2023

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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

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

1/5/2023

- ? State of Oaxaca : Please submit a English-translated co-financing letter.
- ? CONANP, SADER, BIENESTAR : change ?Grant? to ?Public Investment?
- ? WRI, GIZ ? Source : change ?Other? to ?Donor Agency?

1/30/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE:1/20/2023

WRI, GIZ and Governors Climate and Forest Task Force (GCF TF) have been labelled ?Donor Agency? CER. And contributions from CONANP, SADER and BIENESTAR have been classified as Public Investment in the co-financing table in Section C of the CER.

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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

1/5/2023

For core indicator 1.1 that identified PAs created please clarify whether the Community Management areas, Forest Management areas and UMAs will be formally declared or named during the implementation of the project.

Please explain why indicator 4 has dropped by 50% in terms of coverage compared to the figure at PIF stage.

Please include the core indicator 11 explicitly in the results framework (annex a).

1/30/2023

Core indicator 11 is still not in the results framework Annex A. Please include as previously requested.

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE: 2/09/2023

A new section with GEF-7 Core Indicators applicable to this project has been added to the Project Results Framework, inclusive of Core Indicator 11.

UNEP RESPONSE:1/20/2023

Core Indicator 1.1

A total of 16,652.49 hectares will be declared during project implementation and 33,347.51 hectares will benefit from improved management effectiveness. Clarifying text on areas to be declared or strengthened has been included in Section 1? Part E under the Core Indicators Table and Section 6 Global Environmental Benefits of the CEO Endorsement Request. A table outlining the status of each protected area by protection category, landscape, and status (to be declared or to be strengthened) has been prepared and included in Annex O of this CEO Endorsement Request and Appendix 19 of the UNEP Project Document.

Core Indicator 4

Please consider a double entry was made under Core Indicator 4 in the GEF Portal when reporting Core Indicators at PIF stage. Both the approved PIF and the CEO Endorsement Request documents include a total of 20,000 hectares under Core Indicator 4. Apologies for the error.

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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

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

1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared.

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

1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

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 CEO Endorsement Request

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. 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

1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/5/2023

The format of the budget is blurry and not possible to read, thus not possible to review. Please upload a newly formatted budget and then we will be able to review send our comments then if appropriate (hint: the columns per year could be removed, making the table slimmer and readable).

1/30/2023

Clearly legible budget has been submitted. Two vehicles are requested, and this request is cleared by the PM.

However, a number of other elements have been identified that must be resolved now that the budget is legible:

- The column "Responsible Entity" is off the margins so please fix so everything fits in the margins.
- Office supplies are repeated twice: once as "Office supplies" and "Stationery" (\$13,644), then as "Office Utilities" (\$41,490). Please present them only once and charge them to PMC, not to the components.
- "Other Miscellaneous supplies" (\$25,000) are unspecified expenditures that cannot be charged to the GEF funds - either provide details or cover them with co-financing resources.

- ?Office rental? has to be charged to PMC, not to the components.

- ?Supervision site visits / performance monitoring? (\$70,000) is a M&E activity that needs to be covered by M&E budget, not by project components

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE:1/20/2023

We have accepted the hint provided by the GEF and removed the budget by year to make it more easily readable.

UNEP RESPONSE: 2/09/2023

The column ?Responsible Entity? has been reformatted.

Please note that ?Office Utilities? refer strictly to electricity, telephone, internet, and water. It does not consider anything that would normally be considered under ?Office Supplies? such as stationery, ink, toner, etc. We have provided clarification to the ?Office Utilities? budget line by specifying what it covers. ?Office Supplies? is now charged exclusively to PMC.

The ?Other Miscellaneous Supplies? budget line has been removed.

?Office Rental? is charged exclusively to PMC.

?Supervision site visits/performance monitoring? is charged exclusively to M&E.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/5/2023

Yes. Can you please label the GEF-7 core indicators that are currently presented in the project logframe.

1/30/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE:1/20/2023

The GEF-7 core indicators that are currently presented in the Project Results Framework - Annex A of the CEO Endorsement Request and in Appendix 4 of the UNEP Project Document have been duly labelled.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

NA

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared. Response to Germany was adequate.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared. Response to STAP was more than adequate.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/5/2023

Yes. Clear and thorough maps.

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
1/5/2023

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

1/5/2023

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

1/5/2023

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/17/2023

Please address all issues above and resubmit.

Also, under project information: please correct the implementation start date to 6/1/2023.

1/30/2023

Please revise remaining issues:

1) CI 11 should be explicitly indicated in Annex A results framework as previously requested.

2) Revise the budget per guidance above.

2/15/2023

Yes, cleared. All revisions adequate.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/4/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations