



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change			
Country(ies):	Mexico	GEF Project ID: ¹	4763
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4647
Other Executing Partner(s):	National Commission for Protected Natural Areas (CONANP), National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR), National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Submission Date:	August 28, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	1,017,273
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1.1.1. New protected areas (potential for 1 new marine PA 369,139 ha.) and coverage of unprotected ecosystems (600 000 hectares). Output 1.1.2. New protected areas (potential for 1 new marine PA 369,139 ha.) and coverage (600 000 hectares) of unprotected threatened species. Output 1.1.3. Sustainable financing plans (12)	GEFTF	9,691,224.24	73,442,166.00
Project Management Cost			GEFTF	481,502.76	3,529,794.00
Total project costs				10,172,727.00	76,971,960.00

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: The Mexican Protected Area system is spatially configured and managed to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change on biological diversity.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1. Mexican PA system readiness framework	TA	Safeguarding BD across the entire Mexican PA system (25,384,818ha)	1.1 Strengthened decision making tools and instruments aimed at	GEFTF	1,225,054.36	5,492,880.00

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

		<p>from predicted CC impacts (increase in temperatures, compression of rainfall, increased intensity of storms; increased frequency of droughts)</p> <p>Adaptive capacity of the PA authorities cost effectively enhanced to address CC risk including institutional readiness framework and staffing skills</p>	<p>informing management and finance decisions to address CC risk to PA and promote resilience of ecosystems and communities against CC-induced threats.</p> <p>1.2 Multisectoral financing framework through institutional mainstreaming and coordination supports ecosystemic and community resilience.</p> <p>1.3 ECCAP implementation mechanisms and monitoring systems of BD and CC in coordination with other actors.</p>			<p>4,692,880 CONANP</p> <p>800,000 UNDP</p>
<p>Component 2. Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency.</p>	INV	<p>At least 600,000 ha of new area included in new or existing conservation areas nationwide (from a baseline of 25,384,818ha) in order to promote connectivity and protect important refugia.</p> <p>Functional connectivity between critical habitat blocks surrounding PAs maintained to enhance resilience in at least 30,000ha.</p>	<p>2.1 National PA expansion in priority ecoregions based on a landscape approach and facilitated by climatic and biological information, GIS database and marine and terrestrial connectivity studies.</p> <p>2.2 Incentive schemes in place</p> <p>2.3 PA gazettement through Government declarations including boundary demarcation and management plans; provision for public consultation; determination of governance arrangements, zoning plan and use rights for different zones with guidelines for implementing CC resilience and monitoring</p> <p>2.4 Functional connectivity improved between PAs and large habitat blocks outside PAs through resilience oriented management actions.</p>	GEFTF	2,923,180.00	<p>27,454,280.00</p> <p>17,454,280 CONANP</p> <p>3,000,000 CONAFOR</p> <p>500,000 CONABIO</p> <p>500,000 ENDESU</p> <p>6,000,000 GIZ</p>
<p>Component 3. PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores.</p>	INV	<p>Tested cost-effective management mechanisms to address site specific threats in 17 priority vulnerable PAs in 12 ecoregions, covering 6,486,509 ha (e.g. increased frequency of fires, pest, fragmentation)</p>	<p>3.1 Strengthened management of vulnerable PAs based on participatory planning processes, focused on the design and implementation of Programmes of Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) for each site (based on site-specific information to address predicted CC</p>	GEFTF	5,542,989.88	<p>40,495,006.00</p> <p>26,323,046.00 CONANP</p> <p>6,000,000 CONAFOR</p>

		Improved management effectiveness as measured by METT scores (target to be defined during PPG phase)	threats; protection of erosion; integrated fire management and control practices; improved disease outbreak control; management of corridors and improved production practices) in order to reduce vulnerability.			2,171,960 FMCN
		Reduced vulnerability of species and ecosystems threatened by CC.	3.2 Strengthened land use governance framework to guarantee PA conservation and increase resilience to CC risk.			6,000,000 GIZ
			3.3 Community capacity development programmes for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for increasing resilience in PAs.			
			3.4 Ordinances or other instruments that contribute to the reduction of forest fragmentation, and municipal action plans for environmental contingencies. (formerly PIF 2.2)			
			3.5 Operationalization of PA management and surveillance/ enforcement with key stakeholders (formerly PIF 2.5)			
Subtotal					9,691,224.24	73,442,166.00
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEFTF	481,502.76	3,529,794.00 CONANP
Total project costs					10,172,727.00	76,971,960.00

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	National Commission for Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)	Grant	52,000,000
National Government	National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)	Grant	9,000,000
National Government	National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Grant	500,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	800,000

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

CSO	Natural Spaces and Sustainable Development (ENDESU)	Grant	500,000
CSO	Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN)	Grant	2,171,960
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Grant	12,000,000
Total Co-financing			76,971,960

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	BD	Mexico	10,172,727	1,017,273	11,190,000
Total Grant Resources				10,172,727	1,017,273	11,190,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	173,000		173,000
National/Local Consultants	3,642,240	Under review	3,642,240

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

The project design closely follows the objectives, outcomes, components, GEF budget and co-financing specified in the PIF. There has been no change in the GEF budget total, and the co-financing budget total increased. The only significant variations to the project components are as follows:

a) Activities related to (i) Ordinances or other instruments that contribute to the reduction of forest fragmentation, and municipal action plans for environmental contingencies; and (ii) Operationalization of PA management and surveillance/ enforcement with key stakeholders, have been moved from Component 2 to Component 3 so that they are linked to specific on-the-ground interventions envisioned in the pilot activities. To address these shifts, as well as the resource needs associated with the pilot interventions in Outcome 3, there has been a reallocation of GEF funds between the three components:

Outcome	PIF	ProDoc
1	1,998,388	1,225,054.36
2	4,000,000	2,923,180.00
3	3,815,703	5,542,989.88
Total	9,814,091	9,691,224.24

A.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPA!

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.: N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A

A.3 *The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:* UNDP has a Framework and the project is aligned with it.

A.4. *The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:* The Project Document contains substantially expanded information and analysis regarding the baseline project and problem issues. This represents a strong and well-reasoned platform for project implementation. However, the baseline project and core challenges identified during project preparation were not substantially different from those identified in the original PIF.

A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: N/A

A.6. *Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:*

The risk table has been updated based on the PPG findings:

Risk	Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Institutional rigidity and resistance to inter-institutional collaboration	M	Within the context of the ECCAP, the project will support CONANP in raising awareness among diverse institutional stakeholders, of the implications that the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and PA will have for their institutional goals, and will actively promote and facilitate inter-institutional analyses of needs and mechanisms for cooperation.
Weak enforcement of land use stipulations in the landscape	L	The project will build on the considerable advances made to date by previous GEF projects in Mexico with the strengthening and financing of PA management (including enforcement). This project will seek to ensure that financial sustainability strategies take into account the additional requirements arising from issues and threats related to climate change, with the result that enforcement capacities will develop in parallel with the magnitude of threats.
Uncertainty in anticipated threat profiles: strengthening of the resilience of PA and BD is the central focus of the project, however the risk exists that rates of climate change, and associated pressures on PA and BD, will exceed the levels anticipated and the rates of adaptation achievable through the strategies proposed by the project.	L	The project will apply principles of adaptive management, updating its assumptions and strategies regularly on the basis of the most recent models of climate change that are available, keeping abreast of the latest advances with scientific knowledge and experiences regarding best practices for adaptation and resilience, and supporting the development of systems for monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of its strategies under evolving conditions of climate change (Component 1).
Gender inequality in project-promoted activities. Gender equality issues are not promoted as anticipated.	M	The project will adopt a strategy incorporating awareness-raising activities on this issue for men and women. It also anticipates the incorporation of women into decision-making processes and their increased access to natural resources.
Climate Change modifies habitat conditions in PA	M	The ecosystem restoration measures to be undertaken through the project will serve in part to reverse the habitat degradation which may be exacerbated by CC: the restoration strategies themselves will be designed to take into account a range of climate change scenarios, rather than solely the current conditions in the areas.

		Planning and management instruments will be introduced into each of the PA to increase the abilities of PA managers to respond effectively to CC-related risks, both in the short term (e.g. increased incidence of fires) and medium term (changes in levels of external threats and capacities of ecosystems to respond to them).
Change in government administration (at federal, state and/or municipal levels related to the project impact area) leads to a shift in priorities in policy and resources	M	The project will ensure consistent communication and coordination with public officers of the three levels of government administration (federal, state and municipal) to foster a sense of project ownership among new stakeholders and guarantee its continuity.
Delay in cofinancing causes interruptions in implementation.	L	Cofinancing commitment letters ensure the financial resources of the institutions involved in project execution and promote constant coordination/communication among partners/cofinanciers.
Stakeholders have priorities that are inconsistent with the projects targets	M	The project will work towards the alignment of institutional and political frameworks and the coordination and participation of local stakeholders in order to promote appropriation and the synergy of priorities and objectives.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Steps will be taken by the project’s Operational Group (OG) to ensure close coordination and communication with other National Project Coordinators who are managing related projects to coordinate and synchronize efforts as well as promote cross-fertilization, where possible. CONANP has several projects related to climate change resilience that were constructed with a similar vision. In particular, strategic coordination with the following projects will lead to increased benefits for Mexican biodiversity and communities living in and around PAs.

The WB/GEF project “Coastal watersheds conservation in response to climate change”, executed by CONANP and FMCN works toward the strengthening of integrated management of coastal watersheds in the Gulf of Mexico and the Gulf of California, as a way to increase resilience. It upholds the consolidation of management staff in PAs and the support to forest owners that promote conservation, especially of forest corridors that connect protected areas, through CONAFOR’s PES. It follows the same landscape approach, engages sustainable development with community members, and one of the benefited PAs is Pantanos de Centla, thereby providing an opportunity for direct engagement with this project.

The WB/GEF project “Adaptation measures in face of climate change impacts in coastal wetlands in the Gulf of Mexico” promotes the adaptation of wetlands to climate change through the implementation of pilot activities that will provide information on the costs and benefits of different resilience-promoting alternatives.

The Project will benefit from the UNDP/GEF project “Enhancing National Capacities to manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by implementing the National Strategy on IAS,” executed by CONABIO. The Project will also benefit from the UNDP/GEF project “Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats,” executed by CONANP.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Stakeholder participation was emphasized during project preparation. Over one hundred representative government agencies, donors, NGO’s, private enterprises and local community groups were engaged through dozens of formal and informal discussions at the national and field level. The Strategic Results Framework workshop was an important event that brought together a variety of stakeholders to discuss barriers, solutions, strategies, activities and priority regions for project intervention. CONANP staff facilitated the METT scoring exercise. The project design is fully vetted and stakeholder supported.

Project implementation will carry forward the same spirit of participation and inclusivity. Formal implementation

guidance will be offered by a project steering committee comprised of representatives of key organizations. A technical advisory board will further enhance participation. Stakeholder committees, in the form of Community Advisory Councils and brigades, will be established at each project site to formalize participation. A much broader range of stakeholders will be integrated within project inception, planning, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Project management tools such as the project inception work plan, mid-term review, and final evaluation will be made available to all interested stakeholders. The project management office, located in CONANP, will be responsible for catalyzing both formal and informal stakeholder participation.

Project activities will engage a wide and complex stakeholder base. Under Outcome 1, national, state, and local level stakeholders will inform the design of regulatory reforms through programs and seminars that facilitate outreach and participation. Under Outcome 3, national and local stakeholders will benefit from numerous training programs that emphasize peer-to-peer communication, participation, and learning. The project activities require the design of protocols for integrating issues related to gender mainstreaming in decision-making. Local community members will benefit from conservation area management planning that sets in place lasting participation pathways.

The project has benefited from high-level government support since its initiation, particularly from top-level policy makers in CONANP. The table below represents the expected roles of each of the key stakeholders during the implementation of the project:

STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR ROLE IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Stakeholders	Project Implementation Role
SEMARNAT	Incorporate in all areas of the society and public administration criteria and tools to ensure optimal protection, conservation and use of natural resources. Include lessons learned and key messages in relevant international processes related to biodiversity and climate change. It is also the institution responsible of developing the National Climate Change Strategy and the Special Program on Climate Change.
CONANP	The Government agency with lead responsibility for the management of natural protected areas, and therefore most directly responsible for ensuring that appropriate strategies for adapting the management of PA to the effects of climate change are applied in an effective manner. It will be the executing agency of the project, in close coordination with CONABIO and CONAFOR.
CONABIO	Responsible for the promotion, coordination, support and realization of activities aimed at increasing knowledge of biological diversity and its conservation and sustainable use: the national institution with greatest capacities for the generation, management, analysis and communication of information on the magnitude, nature and implications of climate change for PA management. CONABIO is also responsible for promoting the implementation of biological corridors in the six southern states of Mexico: Campeche, Chiapas, Oaxaca, Quintana Roo, Tabasco and Yucatan.
CONAFOR	Responsible for the promotion of forest management, forest conservation and restoration, and the formulation of plans and programs for sustainable forest management. In the context of the project, responsible for developing strategies for the adjustment of forest management in conservation areas to climate change.
INECC	Generate, integrate and disseminate knowledge and information through applied scientific research and capacity building, to support the development of environmental policy and decision making to promote sustainable development
SAGARPA	Lead institution of the agricultural, livestock and fisheries sectors: will participate in the development and promotion of strategies for adjusting management activities in these sectors, in or adjoining conservation areas, to the effects of climate change.
Municipal governments	Responsible for overseeing natural resource management at local level, within their areas of jurisdiction, for ensuring that management strategies are appropriate to local needs and for ensuring that the needs of local stakeholders are taken into account in the definition of management strategies.
NGOs	Civil society organizations make an important contribution to the management of protected areas and to obtaining resources. In addition, they will be involved in providing technical assistance for the implementation of the project. They include The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Mexican

	Fund for Nature Conservation (FMCN), the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the AMBIO Cooperative and Mexican Fauna Protection (PROFAUNA), and members of the Gender and Environment Network (Red de Género y Medio Ambiente).
Universities and Research Centers	Several universities and research centers are actively involved through their academic and research programs in the use and management of natural resources in terrestrial, marine or coastal zones. These include: Universidad Autónoma de Mexico (UNAM) entities, such as the Biology Institute, the Atmosphere Sciences Center, the Geography College, the Geography institute, the Ecology Institute, among others. They will contribute to the consolidation of the resilience strategies through research related to biodiversity and climate change, especially through the external Technical Advisory Committee.
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP-Mexico)	UNDP-Mexico is the Project Implementing Agency that works to overcome poverty and promote sustainable development in Mexico. UNDP-Mexico offers guidance, technical support, management tools, and theoretical and practical knowledge to national- and regional-level institutions to aid in implementing public policies, initiatives, and projects intended to overcome poverty. UNDP will support substantive project development and will make its installed capacity available to the Project, guaranteeing the accountability of the project.

Participation of local stakeholders will be ensured through a series of workshops, consultations and other meetings with the PA Advisory Councils and other local participation forums, carried out in close coordination with PA directors and field-officers. As an overall work strategy for the project, the cost-effective management activities generated during the PPG phase for the specific PAs that the project will focus on, will be validated and expanded upon, identifying specific communities to partner with, where appropriate. Likewise, the strategies to be followed for the execution of the project and the roles of each of the stakeholders in the process will be validated and expanded upon.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The main benefit is the ability of the PA system to continue to generate ecosystem services for the whole country. Populations vulnerable to CC impacts on BD for livelihoods will be benefited from the increased resilience offered by the protected areas; reducing vulnerability and the costs of addressing the effects of climate change. Also, local communities will benefit from the resilient and sustainable productive systems developed by or strengthened by the project. Moreover, they will benefit from the governance framework and the participation in the management decisions. Expansion of PAs will specifically take the needs of women into account.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

During project design, several alternative scenarios were considered from the point of view of cost-effectiveness. These comprised the inclusion of random PAs, charismatic PAs, PAs within one ecosystem, among others. Stakeholders eventually abandoned these options after carefully considering conservation priorities relevant to a limited budget. In order to attain the highest impacts results with the lowest cost, the ecoregional approach was the obvious choice, since it contributes to sustainability and replicability of the project. Moreover, in the ecoregions where priority PAs were close from each other forming natural landscapes, both (or all three) PAs were included in an ecoregional cluster, in order to have a greater impact on more PAs with the same budget. Vulnerability analyses are also vital from the cost-effectiveness point of view, since they will show the priority actions that will have the highest benefits, and the lowest cost compared to inaction. In the end, the highly precise and, therefore, cost-effective investment rests on a number of principles, each integrated within the activities and expenditures of this proposed project.

The project will work to build upon and enhance existing national experience and expertise. This includes subcontracting of in-country NGOs and experts to take primary responsibility for key outputs, on a competitive basis. National NGOs and experts will be contracted to complete several activities under Outcomes 1-3.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP Country Office (CO) and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and program advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including: (a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. (b) Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RSC staff vis à vis the project team. (c) Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. (d) The Terms of Reference (TOR) for project staff will be discussed again as needed. (e) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks. (f) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, M&E requirements. The M&E work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled. (g) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit. (h) Plan and schedule Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PSC meeting should be held within the first 2 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Project Implementation Workplan: Immediately following the inception workshop, the project will be tasked with generating a strategic workplan. The workplan will outline the general timeframe for completion of key project outputs and achievement of outcomes. The workplan will map and help guide project activity from inception to completion. To ensure smooth transition between project design and inception, the inception workshop and work planning process will benefit from the input of parties responsible for the design of the original project, including as appropriate relevant technical advisors.

Quarterly: Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Report (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot. Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually (Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR)): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following: (a) Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative); (b) Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual); (c) Lesson learned/good practice; (d) AWP and other expenditure reports; (e) Risk and adaptive management; (f) ATLAS QPR; (g) Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits: UNDP CO and the RSC will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the PSC may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RSC and will be circulated no more than one month after the visit to the project team and PSC members.

Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review during mid-point of project implementation (project months 28 – 29). The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term. The organization and terms of reference of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The TOR for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the RSC and UNDP-GEF. This independent expert will be recruited at least six months prior to the planned commencement of the mid-term review. The management response and the review will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term review cycle.

End of Project: An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PSC meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project’s results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The TOR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the RSC and UNDP-GEF.

The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project’s results.

Learning and knowledge sharing: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and Visibility Requirements

The project will comply with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines, which can be accessed at:

<http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other requirements, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP and the logos of donors to UNDP projects are used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The [GEF logo](#) can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo

Full compliance will also be observed with the GEF’s Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the “GEF Guidelines”), which can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf.

These guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. These Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements will be similarly applied.

Audit Clause

The project will be audited in accordance with the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

M&E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Manager ▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Baseline Indicators and Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP/CONANP/PCU will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	Indicative cost: 45,000	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Manager ▪ Project team 	Indicative cost: 45,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF 	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU 	None	Quarterly
Project Steering Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ UNDP CO 	None	Following Project IW and subsequently at least Quarterly
Technical Advisory Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF 	Indicative cost: 5,000	Annually
Mid-term Review, including update of METT and ESSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RSC ▪ External Consultants (i.e. review team) 	Indicative cost: 40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation, including final METT and ESSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RCU ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 40,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ PCU 	15,000 (indicative cost per year: 3,000)	Annually
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RSC (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Annually
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 200,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Claudia Grayeb Bayata	Deputy Director General	Ministry of Finance and Public Credit	12/02/2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		August 28, 2013	Lyes Ferroukhi, Regional Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302-4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: Mainstreaming environment and energy					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Strengthened national and local capacities for mitigation and adaptation to climate change					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area : 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy: Technical and institutional capacities to promote environmental sustainability developed					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: SO 1 – Improve sustainability of protected area systems					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 1.1 - : Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool.					
Project Objective:	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
The Mexican Protected Area system is spatially configured and managed to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change on biological diversity	CC resilience is mainstreamed into Mexico’s PA system	CONANP has a Climate Change Strategy, but resilience to CC is not reflected in planning and management instruments:	CONANP planning and management instruments mainstream CC resilience	PA planning and management instruments and guidelines	<u>Assumptions:</u> Institutional stability and commitment throughout project implementation.
	Financial sustainability to increase resilience of Mexican PA system	CONANP budget does not address resilience activities. No multisectorial coordination platform exists regarding efforts and investments on PA at a subnational level.	Internal budgetary restructuring to allocate 10% of CONANP budget to resilience activities. Multisectorial platform to attain budgetary coordination.	CONANP budget documents	Institutional insertion of CC Resource availability to invest in resilience-based BD management practices. Willingness within the GoM to commit funding/resources to resilience-based practices. National and international macroeconomic conditions remain stable. Consensus among local stakeholders for PA expansion and connectivity. <u>Risks:</u> Extreme weather events, Fires, Pests and

					Invasive species, beyond predicted levels.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Outcome 1	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1. Mexican PA system readiness framework effectively safeguards BD.	Institutional framework strengthened to increase PA resilience from CC impacts and risks.	<p>CONANP framework includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -National PA Program (PNANP) 2013-18 and CONANP Strategy for 2040 are under construction -ECCAP provides general guidelines towards resilience but not aligned with public and institutional policy - Communication strategy provides limited promotion of conservation areas as instruments of resilience 	<p>-CONANP Strategy for 2040 and other Institutional Plans include CC and resilience</p> <p>-PNANP 2013 – 2018 includes CC and resilience</p> <p>-ECCAP updated and aligned with public and institutional policy (PNANP) and legal framework related to CC</p> <p>-Communication Strategy (by Year 2) promotes the importance of conservation areas as instruments to (a) increase resilience of communities and ecosystems and (b) maintain integrity across the landscape/seascape</p>	<p>Planning and Policy Documents:</p> <p>PNANP 2013-18</p> <p>ECCAP</p> <p>CONANP Strategy for 2040</p> <p>Communication strategy and information materials</p>	<p><u>Assumptions:</u> Institutional timing and political will are in line for the elaboration of a regulation</p> <p>There is high-level political will to institutionalize CC resilience in the national system of PAs.</p>
	Planning, Management and Information System for decision making to mainstream CC into integrated land-use planning that increases biodiversity resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No National Climate Information Portal for Protected Areas exists - 0% PAs with access to Portal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Climate Information Portal for Protected Areas established with geospatial data, including an Early Alert System and linked to the already existing monitoring efforts (as SNIB, INFyS and SIMEC and other relevant initiatives). - 100% PAs with access to Portal and staff trained to use it to make effective resilience-based management decisions. 	National Climate Information Portal	Availability of regional forecasts and predicted CC impacts on BD

Outcome 2	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
2. Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency.	Expansion of areas of conservation in priority ecoregions and refugia facilitated by GIS database, measured by the increase in area under conservation to promote connectivity and protect important refugia.	0 ha (total ANP 25,384,818 ha)	25,984,818 ha: At least 600,000 ha of new areas included in new or existing conservation areas nationwide: Coastal/marine: 369,139 ha Terrestrial: 230,861 ha By Year 2 a strategy will define distribution between the 12 ecoregions (linked to the information system and GIS from Outcome 1)	CONANP records Agreements with communities/ejidos Official Gazette; ANP documents and other certificates	Consensus among local stakeholders for PA expansion and connectivity. Local actors understand the role of conservation measures in reducing social vulnerability.
	Area of functional connectivity between critical habitat blocks surrounding and within PAs maintained or increased to enhance ecosystem resilience through ecoregion-based incentive schemes	0 ha General incentives exist for BD conservation	30,000 ha that enhance connectivity and ecoregion incentives schemes, as a partial result from management actions from Outcome 3 12 eco-region based incentive schemes/portfolios that enhance resilience	ANP documents and other certificates Portfolio of incentives	

Outcome 3	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
3. PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores.	Strengthened management of vulnerable PAs, based on site-specific information generated from pilots in order to address CC risks and threats, with a landscape focus and sustainable productive activities: a) Increased management capacity of priority PAs reflected in METT scores	- Average METT score 69% ⁵ - Current METT does not include a resilience	- Increase of 10% in the METT scores ($\bar{x} = 79\%$) - Recommendation for	METT Scorecard with CC components applied at PPG, MTR and TE	Continued GoM support for PA management improvement

⁵ For additional information on individual PA METTs, please see Annex 2.

Outcome 3	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	<p>b) Cost-effective management actions to reduce vulnerability, to be undertaken in ecoregional clusters (<i>based on 2012 data and to be confirmed by Vulnerability Analysis at end of Year 2</i>)⁶: These actions will contribute to the surface of improved connectivity in Outcome 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated fire management - Assisted terrestrial regeneration - Assisted coastal regeneration - Assisted marine regeneration - Sustainable land management - Prevention, control, eradication, and monitoring of introduced/ invasive species 	<p>component</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 resilience-based projects or management actions to reduce vulnerability - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 100 ha 	<p>inclusion of a resilience component in METT, based on EHI and other initiatives, by Year 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resilience-based projects and management actions reduce vulnerability in 12 ecoregional clusters <p>Target for Year 1 [<i>Final targets TBD based on Vulnerability Analysis at end of Year 2</i>]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6,000 ha + 10 km firebreaks - 3600 ha +5km gallery forest - 400 ha - 200 ha - 600 ha - 650 ha 		<p>Risk: the country's security conditions could lead the government to decide that community brigades are inappropriate or unsafe.</p>
	<p>Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for increasing resilience in PAs.</p>	<p>Average score on Capacity Development Scorecard⁷:</p> <p>Q 9: 1.625 Q 11: 1.625 Q 13: 1.6875 Q 14: 1.3125</p> <p><u>Areas to be improved:</u></p> <p>(Q9) Most PAs have adequate Management Programs but are</p>	<p>Average score on Capacity Development Scorecard increases by at least 1 point:</p> <p>Q 9: 2.625 Q 11: 2.625 Q 13: 2.6875 Q 14: 2.3125</p> <p><u>Specific improvements:</u></p> <p>Management instruments are implemented effectively in selected PAs.</p>	<p>GEF Capacity Development Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR and TE</p>	

⁶ For information on the surface of ecoregional clusters identified *a priori* for cost-effective management strategies, please see Annex 7.

⁷ Q9 = Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process.

Q11= Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making.

Q13= Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer.

Q14= Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process.

Outcome 3	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		<p>implemented partially or not at all.</p> <p>(Q11) Environmental information used to support decision making processes is unavailable, incomplete or out-of-date.</p> <p>(Q13) Capacity and technological needs are, when available, obtained through external financing.</p> <p>(Q14) Monitoring is done irregularly, with or without an adequate monitoring framework.</p>	<p>Information system for adaptive management (Outcome 1).</p> <p>Institutional capacity development program and 3% of CONANP budget (from Outcome 1) reassigned to basic technological needs.</p> <p>National monitoring system with proper capacity building (Outcome 1).</p>		
	<p>Governance framework regarding land-use is strengthened through coordination and gender- and indigenous -sensitive participation forums to consider PA conservation and increased risks associated with CC.</p>	<p>Mexico Resiliente Alliance provides an advisory role.</p> <p>Community Advisory Councils are not engaged in CC resilience. Only 8 of 17 PAs have advisory councils and 2 operate irregularly.</p> <p>0 Gender organizations and official institutions responsible for gender equality recognized as stakeholders and consulted in PA decision-making processes</p>	<p>Mexico Resiliente Alliance institutionalized as a national advisory council and its members co-implementing at least one project in the field</p> <p>Strengthened Community advisory councils or ad hoc groups to enhance land use governance in 17 PAs contribute to CC resilience measures/activities.</p> <p>TBD Gender organizations and official institutions responsible for gender equality recognized as stakeholders and consulted in PA decision-making processes</p>	<p>Minutes from Mexico Resiliente Alliance meetings; project proposal</p> <p>Minutes from Community Advisory Council meetings</p> <p>Agreements with gender organizations</p>	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Response	References
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>GEF Secretariat</u></p> <p>The CEO endorsement request should describe how protected area authorities have consulted or will consult community groups, indigenous peoples, and CSOs which will be impacted by the expansion of existing protected areas and who live near the 12 PA sites that will undertake climate change resiliency measures.</p>	<p>The process to decree or expand a PA in Mexico is based on the prior and informed consent of communities who live in the zone. The law (LGEEPA) establishes that any PA proposal must consider social aspects of local communities. Every proposal must be submitted for public consultation.</p> <p>Traditionally, CONANP works in the establishment and maintenance of wide communication channels with local stakeholders like communities, academia, indigenous people and NGOs to discuss with them the creation or expansion of a PA.</p> <p>CONANP recognizes one of the main factors determining the viability or not of the sustainability of conservation and development processes in PA is the involvement of society in those processes. Protected Areas in Mexico have plural and inclusive local participation forums named Advisory Councils (AC). These councils are established among the local stakeholders such as landowners, indigenous population, minority groups (e.g. organized women), in order to promote local participation and integration of society in the conservation and development issues in PA. Six of the benefitted PAs have an operating AC, and two have an AC but operate inefficiently. The project will engage the cooperation with the existing ACs to promote the participatory implementation of the activities, and will ensure the formation of the missing ACs. Moreover, governance is one of the four main concepts that the project is taking into account to improve management effectiveness. Hence, all the</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 131-134 (governance), 141-142 and 195.</p> <p>Section 2.8 (Sustainability), paragraphs 217 and 218.</p> <p>Section 5.2 (Key stakeholders involved in the project), paragraphs 247-254.</p>

	<p>Programs of Adaptation to Climate Change will include a participation component, constructed particularly for each PA recognizing the barriers and opportunities to achieve coordination among stakeholders.</p>	
<p><u>STAP</u></p> <p>STAP would welcome an opportunity to play a role in project implementation, through for instance participation on a scientific advisory committee if this is envisioned.</p>	<p>The project shares this interest in having the STAP participate in the technical advisory committee, formed by experts on PA conservation and climate change adaptation, which will accompany the decisions and evaluate the technical feasibility of them</p>	<p>Section 5.1 (Arrangements and responsibilities) paragraph 240</p>
<p>The approach proposed in the project builds on the well documented baseline work of Mexico to develop strategies for mitigation and adaptation to climate change based on sound science. While STAP strongly supports this project there are several aspects of the project that STAP proposes that could benefit from additional clarification. In addition, STAP wishes to stress the protected area management issues that could provide guidance in similar areas of BD portfolio within the GEF partnership.</p> <p>Fundamental to the work of Component 1 are datasets providing baseline information about ecosystem and species distribution and status and also the established criteria under which the existing protected areas were designated in the first place. The ideal climate change response within a country would be to re-designate protected areas based upon the needs revealed by comprehensive ecological surveys and dependent species distributions in response to predicted change, resulting in possibly radical changes to boundaries of PAs across a country. This will rarely be possible, particularly if some PAs have historically been designated using criteria less well informed by conservation data. For example, Hannah, et al (2007) examining</p>	<p>During the PPG, a complex review of the Mexican PA estate was undertaken to prioritize the PAs that were most representative of their ecoregions and most vulnerable to climate change. The project will conduct a subsequent vulnerability analysis in the first year of implementation to confirm the risk factors related to CC for each ecoregional cluster and the management mechanisms necessary to reduce vulnerability and strengthen resilience of the biodiversity housed within each cluster. Furthermore, Outcome 2's focus on connectivity and expansion of conservation areas will allow for the expected migration of certain species to integrate more suitable areas. In this Outcome, several conservation and management mechanisms will be evaluated and established in critical areas to promote the connectivity and corridors, such as assisted regeneration, wild life conservation and management units (UMA), productive conversion matrixes, among others.</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 133, 141, 169, 171, 191.</p>

<p>areas in Mexico, South Africa and Peru, discuss the compromises necessary to achieve change, which appear to be relevant to the decision making process required during implementation of the present project.</p>		
<p>STAP well understands that much data collection work has already been undertaken in Mexico on the likely change to species distributions and ecosystem boundaries under climate change scenarios, and that it is possible to model changes at relatively high map resolutions. While Mexico's work is exemplary, STAP accordingly advises that there is a danger that the project as presented may be too ambitious in its data needs and that early choices will need to be made to focus on priorities for monitoring ecosystems and species that are sustainable in terms of human and financial resources and systems for the long term and capable of not only tracking key conservation impacts but capable of informing future changes to the protected areas system.</p>	<p>The proposed Portal and BD monitoring system will build upon CONANP's SIMEC, CONABIO's SNIB and CONAFOR's INFYS and will be enhanced by the installation of meteorological monitoring stations nationwide and additional equipment and protocols for monitoring biodiversity in the selected PAs. Each PA will be responsible for monitoring 1 vulnerable species and the ecosystem integrity that safeguards it from climate change. Initial monitoring needs will be covered by the project, and activities are intended to be executed by the PAs' staff. Vulnerable species will be selected according to their capacity to reflect ecological integrity. Rather than develop an entirely new scorecard to measure this, the project will build upon the existing METT with inputs from the Ecosystem Health Index (EHI) and other monitoring scorecards. Additionally, it contemplates accessing resources from programs like PROMOBIO and other projects that work with monitoring to attain long-term sustainability.</p> <p>Currently there exist a number of national environmental monitoring systems which will provide the base for the proposed PA information system. Resources will therefore be prioritized to support the connection and adaptation of these systems focusing on the specific needs of the CONANP. In parallel a national climate change information system (Sistema de Información sobre el Cambio Climático) which is part of the new General law of CC is currently in preparation. The aim of this project is to build and consolidate the system for the selected APs.</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 153-157, 191-193.</p> <p>Section 5.3 (Collaborative arrangements with related projects), paragraphs 263-264.</p>
<p>From a practical perspective, therefore, it would be useful for the proponents to</p>	<p>While initial studies and predictions indicate potential areas to be considered for expansion of existing PAs and/or new</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and</p>

<p>outline their strategy to deal with the realities of present PA boundaries and the criteria to be considered (e.g. prioritization of vulnerable/endemic species, core habitats within ecosystems) that will drive the need for change to existing PA boundaries or designation of new PAs. In particular it would be useful to document under what circumstances land swaps, offsets, and other compensatory measures or other trade-offs might be desirable that can facilitate PA evolution.</p>	<p>conservation areas, the Vulnerability Analysis from Outcome 3 and the GIS analysis from Outcome 1 will help define more precisely the criteria to be considered and territories to be expanded to ensure core habitats are conserved for priority species (vulnerable and/or endemic). Options such as land swaps, offsets and other compensatory measures will be considered where appropriate and/or feasible in the context of the 12 ecoregion incentive schemes under Output 2.2. However rather than aiming at changing the existing boundaries of PA -which would involve high transaction costs and time consuming processes- we are expecting through the project to identify and put in place, in coordination with land owners, a combination of conservation mechanisms and incentives to increase conservation areas.</p> <p>Moreover, according to the landscape approach of the project, the clusters management will include their areas of influence, where many of these activities will be developed, in close coordination with land owners and people who live there. In these zones the above mentioned activities will be developed, such as voluntary conservation areas, UMA, payment for ecosystem services (PSA), and other similar mechanisms that will enhance conservation and connectivity on the surroundings of PA.</p>	<p>outputs/activities), paragraphs 161-164.</p>
<p>Under Component 2, the PIF suggests that production systems resilient to climate change will be encouraged to reduce the chances of expansion of cultivation including into PAs. This is an interesting area to explore and could lead to compatible crop diversification and increased genetic diversity, however, precautions should, be taken to avoid the potential for introducing invasive species on the margins of or within PAs.</p>	<p>The project will emphasize the use of native species in its interventions, particularly those focused on restoration which will be carried out with the support of key partners of the project including CONABIO. The project will also promote diversification of crops and will coordinate with CONABIO's work on Invasive Species to prevent their use in project activities. In the productive systems, the use of creole/local varieties of native products, such as maize, will be promoted to maintain genetic variability.</p> <p>A big part of the resilient productive activities will be based on traditional</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 164, 175-190.</p> <p>Becker, C. D. and K. Ghimire. 2003. Synergy between traditional ecological knowledge and conservation science supports forest preservation in Ecuador. Conservation Ecology 8(1): 1.</p>

	<p>knowledge. The project will pay special attention to the intimate interactions of rural communities with biodiversity and will build upon the traditional activities involving ancient knowledge of the productive systems that perform better in different environments in order to maintain ecosystem health and services. Some of these activities that already are being developed around PAs include the management and conservation of native varieties of agricultural plants, such as maize, and the productive conversion from monocultures to agrobiodiverse crops.</p>	<p>Bocco, G. 1991. Traditional knowledge for soil conservation in central Mexico. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation Volume: 46 5:346-348</p>
<p>Component 3 work could usefully assist the GEF to modify its Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) to include climate change relevant management effectiveness metrics. Improved management effectiveness for resilience or adaptation of PAs to climate change is not currently tested within the METT, therefore the project could consider piloting additions to the METT which would track progress regarding climate-related management requirement.</p>	<p>The project will build upon the METT to include resilience criteria for measuring management decisions that focus on increasing resilience and safeguarding biodiversity from Climate Change.</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraph 192</p> <p>Section 2.9 (Replicability), paragraph 227.</p>
<p>Finally, STAP encourages project proponents to consider the obvious transboundary issues with regard to migratory species and ecosystem based adaptation in project design, and in particular the opportunities for synergy and collaboration. The US National Parks Service is currently in the process of establishing its science and research priorities for the next decade. The US Forest Service has already contributed to the development of CONANP's climate strategy. The US Fish and Wildlife Service also has an international program with a strong interest in migratory species of high</p>	<p>CONANP will take into account the potential to strengthen its work with agencies in other countries working with similar approaches. For instance, CONANP is currently working under the North American Wilderness and Protected Area Committee on climate change strategies, mainly focusing on adaptation strategies. All relevant national institutions among the three North American countries are actively involved and working together. An example of this is the bilateral collaboration on the Big Bend – Río Bravo transboundary region of México and USA. CONANP is working to identify and describe priority conservation regions in</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraph 182</p>

<p>conservation value to both countries.</p>	<p>the area and to propose a conservation strategy. Also CONANP has a close relationship with US Fish and Wildlife Service. Both agencies are working together on the capacity program for rangers “Training for Conservation”. Finally, the project will work in the protected area Mariposa Monarca, which serves as the winter habitat for the monarch butterfly.</p>	
<p>Council Comments:</p>		
<p>Canada:</p> <p>- We agree with the STAP review that the project is innovative and well-prepared, and we note that the project include a very high level of co-financing, mostly from national sources. The Mexican government should be commended for its efforts. The STAP also suggests that the approach taken in this project could help inform GEF tools on climate resilience of its projects. In this context, can the project invest in any evidence-based learning around this innovation, helping to determine how it could be replicated for other GEF projects?</p> <p>All of the biodiversity projects being proposed should provide information on how they relate to the country’s obligations to the CBD, particularly the Aichi Targets. As presented, the PIF is not clear on how it will help the country meet the Aichi targets. The project proponents should provide this information in the final project proposal.</p>	<p>The section on Replicability discusses how the project will invest in evidence-based learning to determine how the impacts of the pilot activities in the ecoregional clusters could be replicated in other GEF projects, either those with similar ecoregions or provide a methodology for identification of appropriate resilience-based actions in other ecoregions. At project end, planning documents and tools will be systematized to support the development of future projects and guide policies and investments on CC resilience issues that involve social components and ecosystem based adaptation.</p> <p>The project will address the Aichi Targets through the improvement of the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity and through increasing significantly the coverage and connectivity of the PA system in important regions with high biodiversity importance and significant ecosystem services, and by increasing management effectiveness of the PA system in a way that is integrated into the wider landscape/seascape. In particular, the project will address the following targets:</p> <p>Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to</p>	<p>Section 2.9 (Replicability), paragraphs 224-228.</p> <p>Section 2 (Strategy), paragraph 106.</p>

	<p>zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced. The project resilience activities and the PA expansion will contribute to reduce the loss of natural habitats by preserving biodiversity, ecological integrity and ecosystem services in at least 630,000 ha.</p> <p>Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes. The 600,000 ha of new protected areas will contribute to increase the percentage of protected territory. In particular, the incorporation of 369,139 ha of new protected islands will increase the marine and coastal areas under protection and the remaining 230,861 ha will increase the terrestrial surface.</p> <p>And the project as a whole addresses the Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Switzerland:</p> <p>Questions, Concerns and Challenges for further Project / Program Refinement</p> <p>A) Component 2, chapter 2.6.: Please explain how the proposed “better stewardship” on private lands and ownership in conservation is expected to be achieved?</p>	<p>A) Component 2: The proposed “better stewardship” referred to in the PIF responds to the project’s strategy to strengthen the capacities and involvement of land owners and local communities in the management of conservation areas under climate change conditions. In Mexico, most of the land in Protected Areas is owned by ejidos, a collective property land tenure which involves all the families and communities who live and belong to these ejidos. A smaller proportion of land is owned either by the State or by small private owners. The project aims at strengthening their capacities on the management of their lands in order to reduce their vulnerability to climate change. Outcome 2 of the ProDoc will focus on promoting with land owners - ejidos and small private owners where applicable- management actions to enhance resilience. One of the assumptions under Outcome 2 is that local actors understand the role of conservation measures in reducing social vulnerability. Social engagement will be key for climate change resilience work in PAs. The ESSP (Annex 6) explains that while specific communities and interventions will be identified through the Vulnerability Analysis, it is expected that the communities in and around the targeted PAs will be engaged in the development and execution of resilience oriented management activities to ensure that they become an integral part of their use and interaction with resident natural resources/ecosystems. Of particular importance to this will be the incentive schemes developed for each of the 12 ecoregional clusters. These will be tailored to the specific conditions (private, public, communal/ejidal ownership) within and around the pilot PAs so as to engage the appropriate stakeholders in activities that promote ecosystem stability and increased resilience.</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraph 149, 164, 204.</p> <p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 131 (governance), 145 and 195.</p> <p>Section 2.8 (Sustainability), paragraph 218.</p>
<p>B) Component 3, chapter 3.3.: Please explain how communities are to be involved for improved PA management.</p>	<p>B) Component 3: Community Advisory Councils and community brigades will be the primary entry points for community involvement. Eight of the benefitted PAs have an AC. The project will engage cooperation with the existing ACs to</p>	<p>Section 5.2 (Key stakeholders involved in the project), paragraph 251.</p>

	<p>promote the participatory implementation of the activities, and will support the development of missing ACs. The TORs for each pilot program will define in more detail the exact role of local communities in each PA. Moreover, local governance is one of the four main concepts that will guide the project's efforts to improve management effectiveness.</p>	
<p>C) Component 3, chapter 26: Please explain indicators to be used to measure and predict CC impacts on a micro-site and which training is to be provided to which target group(s) to build capacities for sustainable monitoring.</p>	<p>C) With regards to the indicators to be used to measure and predict CC impacts, the project will develop a system-wide information portal, BD & CC monitoring instrument and early alert system based on and in collaboration with existing inventories and databases housed within CONABIO and CONAFOR. Each PA within the scope of the project will count on the necessary equipment and capacity building to use this information efficiently and involve it in every-day decision-making. Training will not only be required for the interpretation and use of the information generated by the system, but will also be needed to strengthen the planning, implementation and monitoring capacities of PA staff, and in some cases local communities. This system will play an essential role in allowing the application of an "adaptive management" approach to respond to climate change, which is particularly important given the levels of uncertainty that exist regarding the magnitude and nature of its impact.</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 153-157, 171-174.</p>

<p>D) Has the 43 Mio USD proposed Government co-financing (all grants) been confirmed?</p>	<p>D) Co-financing has been confirmed by all the projects partners. Moreover, an important amount of additional co-financing has been obtained through the collaboration with other projects that share similar goals and/or identified opportunities to contribute directly to the project.</p>	<p>Section 5.3 (Collaborative arrangements with related projects), paragraphs 255-267.</p>
<p>E) 50% of the protected areas under federal jurisdiction are biosphere reserves which do not qualify as protected areas per se, since only core areas enjoy protection status for biodiversity conservation. The figures provided of the total area protected in the country are therefore misleading. Please clarify.</p>	<p>E) In Mexico, the concept of social property (such as ejidos and communal lands) is widespread all over the country. A great amount of land with conservation interest or purpose is under this status, making the Biosphere Reserve modality an ideal option to address both conservation efforts and sustainable development of local communities.</p> <p>In Mexico, Biosphere Reserve is one of the PA categories recognized by national legislation, under the General Law of Ecological Equilibrium and Protection (LGEEPA). Under this law, Biosphere Reserves' boundaries include both the core and the buffer zones which differs from UNESCO's biosphere reserve concept. This particular category defines PA management in such a way that it allows for various ways of sustainable use of biodiversity and promotes traditional use compatible with conservation goals. Studies have confirmed that the protected areas that more effectively avoid land-use change in Mexico are biosphere reserves, precisely because of the involvement of local actors and civil society in the conservation activities (win-win situation).</p>	<p>Figuroa F. and V. Sánchez-Cordero. 2008. Effectiveness of natural protected areas to prevent land use and land cover change in Mexico. <i>Biodiversity Conservation</i> 17:3223-3240.</p> <p>Diario Oficial de la Federación, November 30, 2000. Reglamento en materia de Áreas Naturales Protegidas de la Ley General del Equilibrio Ecológico y Protección al Ambiente. Last reform December 28, 2004.</p>
<p>F) Risk assessment: The proposed use of “adaptive management” to mitigate threats from CC is too unspecific, providing the proponent with a “carte blanche” to change goal posts at will.</p>	<p>F) Adaptive management will be based on information that is currently missing. Moreover, since “resilience” implies local process and dynamics, more specific activities cannot be defined <i>a priori</i>. To address this, ecoregional vulnerability analyses will be performed as a first</p>	

	<p>priority action of the project. Vulnerability analysis will be conducted in the 12 ecoregional clusters with an integral approach and advanced analyses at the local/sub-regional scale. Availability of information is not homogeneous across the clusters, so the assessment approaches will be defined <i>ad-hoc</i>. The analyses will include regional meteorological forecasts to determine potential CC impacts on priority sites within the Mexican PA system and their biodiversity, so as to inform decision-making with more accurate data. The project will support detailed analyses of current ecological, biophysical, social, economic and cultural conditions, including gender implications, as well as the possible implications under different predicted CC scenarios, by national and international experts in each field. As a result of these analyses, specific activities will be defined for each site, to ensure that prioritized threats are mitigated.</p>	
<p>Conclusions and Recommendations</p> <p>The project is too complex and ambitious as presented and therefore not feasible without major changes. The project timeline of 5 years is much too short to gauge project success. Sustainability issues and the cost effectiveness of the USD 45 Mio project are inadequately addressed.</p> <p>The project requires major streamlining and downsizing. Focus should be on clearly defined priority geographical areas offering sound opportunities for stakeholder participation, livelihood stabilization of rural poor and community empowerment and fair equity sharing in order to achieve broadly-based ownership in sustainable biodiversity conservation inside and outside protected areas.</p>	<p>As noted by STAP, the approach proposed in the project builds on Mexico’s well-documented baseline work to develop strategies for mitigation and adaptation to climate change based on sound science. As such, while the timeline will be tight, it is sufficient to put in place the necessary tools and instruments to ensure a real impact on the biodiversity housed within Mexico’s PA estate. Furthermore, during the PPG, CONANP developed a complex methodology in order to identify the PAs to include in the project, choosing PAs that were not only priorities in terms of the BD, their vulnerability to CC, but also their potential for successfully implementing the proposed interventions and provide results to the national system. The project does not expect to achieve resilience to CC in 5 years, but to build the pathway and building blocks to make it a long-term national and sustainable process with the participation of several government institutions, NGOs,</p>	<p>Section 2.4 (Project objective, outcomes and outputs/activities), paragraphs 130-133</p> <p>Section 5.3 (Collaborative arrangements with related projects) Paragraphs 256-268.</p>

	local communities and other stakeholders, thereby paving Mexico's way to achieving resilience and reducing environmental and social vulnerability.	
--	--	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁸

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. GIS analyses of the impacts of climate change on PAs	25,500.00	6,093.00	0.00
2. Studies of the biological and ecological impacts of climate change on PAs and their constituent species and ecosystems	25,500.00	0.00	0.00
3. Review of policy context and regulatory context in relation to PA adaptation to climate change	0.00	7,787.15	0.00
4. Review of capacities among institutional stakeholders to support, realize and sustain the recommended strategies for PA adaptation	0.00	14,481.66	0.00
5. Development of management strategies for selected PA's	15,750.00	15,090.44	0
6. Development of monitoring and evaluation strategy	33,250.00	31,017.17	25,530.58
Total	100,000.00	74,469.42	25,530.58

⁸ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A