

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

Basic Information

GEF ID

10869

Countries

Mexico

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

UNEP: 01797

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

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

9/21/2021

Yes for BD.

The alignment with the LD FA is clear but it weakly presented. There is no mention of LDN whereas this FA contributes to help countries implement their LDN strategy and meet the Convention objectives. Therefore please strengthen the following:

- 1) Please provide a clear explanation of how the proposed activities align with the FA focus on supporting LDN implementation, and
- 2) under the baseline section below explain the current situation of the country vis-à-vis LDN implementation.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

1) The alignment with the LD FA has been further developed in Section 4 (Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies) of the PIF, citing specific activities and outcomes of the project and how they relate to the objectives and anticipated results of the LD FA. Besides, the Commission for Arid Zones (CONAZA), the institution with oversight over Mexico's voluntary LDN targets, has been added to the project stakeholder list under Table 2 (Section 2 Stakeholder Engagement).

2) Relevant information on the status of LDN implementation has been added to the baseline section of the PIF.

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

9/21/2021

Yes, but please note the comment below on the restoration core indicator target.

10/14/2021

Please provide justifications on how PIF targets have been identified.

Kindly also ensure that there are references to Core Indicators targets in the description of project activities for consistency, where appropriate.

10/28/2021

Comprehensive explanation provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

The GEF 7 Core Indicator 3 has been revised to 6,000 ha and Component 2 text revised accordingly. Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) has been included in the pool of integrated landscape management activities and a larger contribution of co-financing to project-led restoration efforts factored in. The corresponding indicator in Table B has also been updated to reflect the following:

Indicator: *# Of hectares restored and/or under ANR*

Target:

3,000 ha of agriculture land (agave agroforestry)

3,000 ha of ANR in degraded forests

10/22/2021

Justifications for PIF targets are summarized in the matrix below on Table B Targets. Description of Core Indicator targets have been added in part below and also to Table F. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEF 7 CORE INDICATORS in the PIF. A slight revision to Core Indicator 6 was made in Table F and Annex B – Core Indicators Worksheet and Annex G was added to shed further light on the methodology for emission reductions and removals calculations by CONAFOR. Reference to Core Indicators was also made, where appropriate, in the description of project activities under Section 3) The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

PIF Table B Target	Justifications
<p>Outcome 1.1: Biodiversity, ecosystem services and sustainable practices mainstreamed in national governance and institutional frameworks linked to a gave harvesting and the production of Mezcal.</p> <p><i>National regulations and state level strategies updated or created, adopted, and under implementation by project mid-term</i></p> <p>Target: 1 national regulation, 1 state strategy</p>	<p>This target seeks to respond to complaints made by the industry that there is no overarching guidance or norms to determine how a sustainable development pathway for the agave-mezcal value-chain could look like at both national and state-levels. This target is guided by what the state and national project partners believe is feasible within one government term in office. The conceptualization and design of the regulation and strategy based on sustainability criteria will be such that they provide the maximum opportunity and policy framework to enable biodiversity mainstreaming and the uptake of sustainability norms.</p>
<p><i>% Increase from baseline in Institutional Capacity Development Scorecard</i></p> <p>Target: 20% increase from baseline</p>	<p>This target seeks to provide a benchmark for efforts to strengthen multi-stakeholder capacity to institutionalize national regulations and state level strategies and plans for the sustainable production of Mezcal. Even though 20% growth in capacity is ambitious, the project preparation team believes this is achievable after having considered the existing capacity baseline and past experiences, and the learning curve and cultural shift involved in increasing institutional capacity at the state level.</p>
<p><i>Inter-institutional Coordination and Oversight Group for Mezcal Production strengthened or created by project mid-term</i></p> <p>Target: 1 Taskforce established and operational</p>	<p>There needs to be interinstitutional and multi-stakeholder coordination and input into efforts to promote sustainability in the agave-mezcal supply chain to ensure environmental, social and economic benefits are observed and actions are sustainable over time. This needs to be a perennial effort that goes beyond the scope of a project-level Steering Committee. The project will scope the best arrangement to this end. The State of Oaxaca has different Governance spaces facilitated through international agencies such as: IUCN, GIZ, Conservation International, AFD and support from the Governors for Climate and Forests Working Group (GCF-TF).</p> <p>The Inter-Institutional Table for the Productive Landscape Restoration (MIIRP) is the result of this international cooperation, where state institutions from the productive sectors, the environment, indigenous peoples and Afro-Mexicans converge (SEMAEDESQ, SEDAPA, COESFO, SEPIA, COPLADE, SECRETARY OF ECONOMY, CONAFOR).</p> <p>The MIIRP is a unique space at the national level whose objective is the</p>

	<p>The MIMAT is a unique space at the national level whose objective is the coordination of the environmental and productive sectors in the territory, which will be strengthened with project support with representatives of the private initiative, civil society organizations and academia.</p>
<p>Outcome 2.1: Increase in area of forests protected, ecosystems services restored and maintained, and threatened and keystone species of high biological value conserved.</p>	
<p><i># Hectares of dry tropical forests protected through new Areas Voluntarily Destined to Conservation (ADVC)</i></p> <p>Target: 9,000 ha</p>	<p>9,000 ha of ADVCS: they are already on a path to certification as ADVCS by CONANP. There is already a community will to declare these areas and develop the necessary studies on the biological importance of these polygons. In these sites, there is the interest of the communities in defining the polygons with greater precision to be certified as ADVC, which implies the preparation of technical assessments and social consensus.</p> <p>The ADVC are polygons identified by CONANP as areas of biological importance in the region, which present low deciduous forest vegetation to contain the monoculture of agave and coniferous forest for the maintenance of environmental services, mainly water.</p>
<p><i># Hectares of dry tropical forests protected through new effective area-based conservation modalities.</i></p> <p>Target: 41,000 ha -Conservation Management Units: 1,000 ha -Community Management: 25,000 ha -Forest Management</p>	<p>The 1,000 hectares proposed as Environmental Management Units are in strategic connectivity sites of the dry forest, which are being degraded by poor agricultural practices such as agave monoculture.</p> <p>The 25,000 hectares correspond to community-managed areas to be promoted in the region to regulate the land uses of the different productive sectors.</p> <p>The 15,000 hectares correspond to properties with non-timber forest management programs in the two landscapes of the project.</p>
<p><i># Of species of high biological value conserved</i></p> <p>Target: 3 agave species, 2 feline, 2 birds</p>	<p><u>3 agaves:</u> listed as threatened and subject to special protection in NOM-059-SEMARNAT-2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agave chiapensis</i> • <i>Agave guiengola</i> • <i>Agave peacockii</i> <p><u>Felines already identified:</u> they fulfill a function of key species requiring protection and considered umbrella species for other species of wild flora and fauna.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>) listed in danger of extinction in NOM-059-SEMARNAT-2010. • Ocelot (<i>Leopardus pardalis</i>) listed in danger of extinction in NOM-059-SEMARNAT-2010.
<p><i># Of pollinator species conserved</i></p> <p>Target: 2 bats, 1 lepidoptera, 1 bee, 2 birds</p>	<p><u>Bats:</u> in danger of extinction and vulnerable in Mexico, listed in the NOM-059-SEMARNAT-2010, both are pollinators of wild agaves that are distributed in the region</p>

<p>Target: 2 bats, 1 reptile, 1 bee, 2 birds</p>	<p>consisted in the region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Leptonycteris nivalis</i> • <i>Leptocercids curasoae</i> <p><u>Birds:</u> they are seed dispersal species of dry forest ecosystems. Both species are in danger of extinction in Mexico, listed in NOM-059-SEMAR NAT-2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Eupherusa cyanophrys</i> (Oaxaca Hummingbird) • <i>Amazona finschi</i> (Lilac-crowned Amazon) <p>Bee: <i>Melipona beecheii</i>, they are pollinators of the ecosystems of the tropics such as the dry forests.</p> <p><i>Note: further detail on aforementioned species was added to Part 6) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDC F/SCCF) in the PIF.</i></p>
<p>Outcome 2.2: ILM practices have reduced LD, increased soil, and woody vegetation carbon sequestration, and enabled sustainable agricultural production on degraded lands.</p>	
<p><i># Of integrated landscape management plans</i></p> <p>Target: 2</p>	<p>This target corresponds to the two landscapes to be subject to project interventions: Yautepec and Yagul.</p>
<p><i># Of hectares restored and/or under ANR</i></p> <p>Target: 3,000 ha of agriculture land 3,000 ha of ANR in degraded forests</p>	<p>The 3,000 hectares of agricultural areas have been chosen to carry out productive landscape restoration in areas with agave monoculture. The increase in the target is due to meetings with COMERCAM (CRM) who received the project proposal very well and considered its viability.</p> <p>Another 3,000 hectares have been chosen for Assisted Natural Restoration in low deciduous forest with high and very high levels of degradation. It was decided to include this activity due to the opportunities that exist in the community forest management and land use planning programs.</p>
<p><i># Of hectares of agave subject to sustainable harvesting practices</i></p> <p>Target: 8,000 ha</p>	<p>The 8,000 hectares proposed were defined as an affordable goal to improve the sustainability of agave production. Both landscapes have important areas dedicated to the sowing of agave and other crops.</p>
<p><i># Of hectares that have reversed monoculture cultivation</i></p> <p>Target: 4,000 ha</p>	<p>This target is believed to be viable due to the genuine concern of producers about the accelerated degradation of soils, the considerable increase in the demand for mezcal from wild agaves, and the increase in profitability due to productive diversification and food security.</p>
<p><i># Metric tCO2e mitigated (direct)</i></p> <p>Target: 210,889 tCO2e</p>	<p>Estimates for tCO2e were calculated using the approach of the National Monitoring, Reporting and Verification System (SNMRV) of CONAFOR. Information on activities and their magnitude were provided by SEMADESO, while information on carbon densities and rates of change in carbon storage per unit area were provided by data generated by the Biomass and Carbon Estimation System (SEBvC) of the SNMRV of CONAFOR.</p>

	<p>ass and Carbon Estimation System (CEES) of the University of Cornell R. Specific details of the approach and the calculations are provided below in the Core Indicator Matrix in the PIF, and the summary calculation table has been added to the PIF as Annex G.</p>
<p><i># Hectares of bio-cultural landscapes subject to ILM best practices</i></p> <p>Target: 20,000 ha</p>	<p>This area represents two biocultural landscapes identified by the agricultural practices that each one presents. Yagul Landscape presents characteristics of "traditional" agriculture that dates from the domestication of wild plants to crops since 12,000 BC. Yautepec Landscape presents characteristics of agriculture with elements of technology transfer.</p> <p>5,000 ha in Yautepec is feasible because they are emerging agriculture projects.</p> <p>15,000 ha Yagul: more area of traditional agriculture crops, which justifies its larger extension and contribution to the target.</p>
<p>Outcome 3.1: Strengthened Mezcal Value Chain based on sustainable practices.</p>	
<p><i>% Of total Mezcal production subject to sustainability standards</i></p> <p>Target: 5%</p>	<p>COMERCAM, which is the certifying authority for mezcal, has not yet developed a certification related to sustainable production. The certification they grant is the Denomination of Origin. SADER and CONABIO are interested in publishing a Mexican standard for the certification of agave-mezcal friendly to biodiversity. The financial mechanism foreseen in the project could guarantee at least 5% of mezcal production in the intervention landscapes.</p>
<p><i>% Of total Mezcal production subject to use of sustainably produced wood included in Forest Management Programmes.</i></p> <p>Target: 5%</p>	<p>This target refers to mezcal production in the intervention landscapes and is intended to be achieved in two clearly defined ways, increasing its probability as a viable target:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establishment of operating rules for access to the financial mechanism that provide incentives for the use of firewood 2) Through Forest Management Programs
<p><i># Of cultural practices linked to agave production, harvesting and mezcal production supported by the project</i></p> <p>Target: 2 cultural practices</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intercropping with the milpa system (traditional form inherited from ancestors) 2. Ancestral distillation using clay pots 	<p>While there are many cultural practices that could be selected for project support, this will require an intensive process of consultation with local indigenous communities to identify and select the specific cultural practices to be supported. This identification process will be done during the PPG phase through participatory processes.</p> <p>Some cultural practices could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sowing on terraces • Use of stone ovens • Distillation in clay pots • Use of wild agave seeds produced by flowering, among others
<p><i># Of Knowledge Management Plans on sustainable mezcal production supported by the project</i></p> <p>Target: 1</p>	<p>The project will develop <u>one</u> integrated KM Plan early in project implementation to maximize the opportunity of embracing KM as a continuous process through-out the project cycle that enables knowledge capture and dissemination related to different project activities associated with</p>

	and dissemination related to different project activities associated with integrated management of biocultural landscapes. This process will potentially include a combination of structured awareness campaign, blogs, website, print material, social media platforms, knowledge, and experience exchanges, etc.
Outcome 3.2: An innovative finance mechanism to upscale sustainable harvesting and processing of agave.	
<i># of beneficiary institutions (i.e.: companies, community enterprises, cooperatives) benefiting from the finance mechanism</i> Target: 5	Initial assessments and consultations have preliminarily identified at least the following beneficiaries, to be confirmed during PPG: Comercam, Mujeres del Mezcal, Cluster Mezcal Oaxaca (Civil organization that includes 'maestros mezcaleros' and producers), Canaimez (private sector organization), Mezcal Producer Cooperatives. Based on preliminary scoping, including through the restoration opportunities assessment study, the target of 5 beneficiary institutions was set.
<i>% Of capitalization from private sector origin</i> Target: 25%	This is a conservative target that builds on the feasibility analysis for a finance mechanism undertaken under the SEMAEDSO-IUCN restoration opportunities assessment study. The target considers funding from impact investors/venture capital, the Agri3Fund, Cluster Mezcal AC, CANAIMEX, and COMERCAM. The project will include a matching criteria in the operating rules of some funding windows of the financial mechanism to help mobilize capitalization.

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

10/14/2021

- USAID should be categorized as a Donor Agency and not Other

- For the Agri3Fund: when looking at the description on their website, it does not look like it should be categorized as Private

Sector – it looks more a Fund. Please clarify and correct if necessary.

10/28/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/22/2021

Reference to USAID as 'Other' has been removed and is now referred to as International Cooperation. Agri3Fund has been recategorized as a Fund.

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

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

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

9/21/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

The results in terms of restoration are too low (1,000 ha of agave monoculture and no forest lands). Considering LD 1.3 (Forest Landscape Restoration) is the most important FA objective of the project, we need to see restoration at the landscape level (including agriculture and forests) especially also because the targeted project area is said to be highly degraded. Please revise.

10/6/2021

Cleared

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

The GEF 7 Core Indicator 3 has been revised to 6,000 ha and Component 2 text revised accordingly. Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) has been included in the pool of integrated landscape management activities and a larger contribution of co-financing to project-led restoration efforts factored in. The corresponding indicator in Table B has also been updated to reflect the following:

Indicator: *# Of hectares restored and/or under ANR*

Target:

3,000 ha of agriculture land (agave agroforestry)

3,000 ha of ANR in degraded forests

Map 1 on Project Intervention Areas, GEF Core Indicator Worksheet on Annex B, and the Safeguards Risk Information Form (SRIF) on Annex G have equally been updated accordingly. What was previously referred to as Map 2 in an earlier PIR (restoration sites), has now been incorporated in Map 1.

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

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

GEF projects are not part of the baseline but should be identified in the section under existing programs in the project area that the new project will collaborate with. Please remove GEF projects from the baseline and explain in the appropriate section the mechanisms for collaboration between existing investments and this new investment.

Please explain in this section the current situation of the country vis-à-vis LDN implementation.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

GEF projects have been removed from baseline section. Mechanisms for collaboration with other GEF projects have been further described in Section 6 of the PIF.

Relevant information on the status of LDN implementation has been added to the baseline section of the PIF.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

As part of the project design strategy, the project plans to promote sustainable plantations of wood for use in Mezcal production. Please confirm the species composition of the plantations and please confirm that these are native species and not invasive in the ecosystem.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

The text under Outcome 3.1 has been updated to reflect the list of native species to be used. No invasive species will be considered.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

The degradation maps are very interesting and help justify the project interventions. It would be a good visual demonstration of the project relevance if the proponents could add the project targeted areas on the land degradation maps.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

Map 4 in Annex A of the PIF now shows degradation of the water recharge function overlayed with project intervention areas, and Map 5 in Annex A of the PIF now shows degradation of the pollination function overlayed with project intervention areas.

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

9/21/2021

Please include a narrative description of the stakeholder discussions that have been held up to the present.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

A narrative description of stakeholder discussions has been added to 'Section 2. Stakeholders' in the PIF.

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

9/21/2021

The description is very generic and does not specifically articulate the importance of gender within the realms of the project activities and how the implementation strategy will reflect this. Please revise.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

Text to highlight the importance of gender within the realms of the project has been added to 'Section 3. Gender and Women's Empowerment' in the PIF and the Mujeres del Agave y del Mezcal (Agave & Mezcal Women) civil association has been added to Table 2 on

project stakeholders (Section 2).

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

Please provide a climate risk assessment given the impact climate will have on this ecosystem and the production activities that have been identifies as well as the restoration strategies to be employed.

10/6/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

A Climate Risk Screening Form has been developed for the project and included as Annex F to the PIF.

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

9/21/2021

Please move all GEF projects that are currently presented in the baseline section to the coordination section of the PIF and articulate the coordination mechanisms that will be required to support collaboration and coordination amongst the GEF projects.

10/14/2021

On Project information: the only entity included in the LoEs for executing the project is the Oaxaca Secretary of Environment, Energy and Development (SEMAEDES) – however, the entity included in Portal is Pronatura Sur. Please ask the Agency to: (i) remove Pronatura Sur; (ii) change it for t.b.d (to be determined); or (iii) get new LoEs including Pronatura Sur as the executing agency. Please note that throughout the preparation of the project, the Executing Entity could be determined accordingly. Similarly, references to Pronatura Sur in section 6 – Coordination need to be presented as yet ‘to be confirmed’ or removed (unless new LoEs are obtained). Note that the Executing Partner can change throughout the project’s preparation.

10/28/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/01/2021

GEF projects have been removed from baseline section. Mechanisms for collaboration with other GEF projects have been further described in Section 6 of the PIF.

10/22/2021

A new Letter of Endorsement was issued by the GEF Focal Point on 22nd October 2021, which clarifies that 'the project will be prepared and implemented by Pronatura Sur in coordination with the Oaxaca Secretariat of Environment, Energy and Development (SEMAEDES0') as the Executing Agencies'. The new LOE has been placed as Annex E to the PIF and the Project Information Table and text in Section 6 'Coordination' of the PIF has been adjusted to reflect the content of the new LOE.

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

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from

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

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

10/14/2021

On Project information: the only entity included in the LoEs for executing the project is the Oaxaca Secretary of Environment, Energy and Development (SEMAEDES) – however, the entity included in Portal is Pronatura Sur. Please ask the Agency to: (i) remove Pronatura Sur; (ii) change it for t.b.d (to be determined); or (iii) get new LoEs including Pronatura Sur as the executing agency. Please note that throughout the preparation of the project, the Executing Entity could be determined accordingly. Similarly, references to Pronatura Sur in section 6 – Coordination need to be presented as yet ‘to be confirmed’ or removed (unless new LoEs are obtained). Note that the Executing Partner can change throughout the project’s preparation.

10/28/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/22/2021

A new Letter of Endorsement was issued by the GEF Focal Point on 22nd October 2021, which clarifies that ‘the project will be prepared and implemented by Pronatura Sur in coordination with the Oaxaca Secretariat of Environment, Energy and Development (SEMAEDES)’ as the Executing Agencies’. The new LOE has been placed as Annex E to the PIF and Project Information Table and the text in Section 6 ‘Coordination’ of the PIF has been adjusted to reflect the content of the new LOE.

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

9/21/2021

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

9/21/2021

No. Please make the revisions noted above and resubmit.

10/14/2021

Please make the last revisions requested above and resubmit as soon as possible.

10/28/2021

The revised submission provides a comprehensive response to all issues raised. Cleared.

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	9/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

