



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4763		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4647 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$10,172,727
Co-financing:	\$76,971,960	Total Project Cost:	\$87,244,687
PIF Approval:	December 19, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	AWV 12/13/11  Yes, Mexico ratified the CBD in March 1993.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	AWV 12/13/11  Yes, the Mexican OFP endorsed the project on December 2, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	AWV 11/13/11  Yes - UNDP has a strong comparative advantage in implementing PA system projects and has experience with natural resource-related adaptation projects.	September 26, 2013  Yes.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	AWV 12/13/11 No.	September 26, 2013 NA.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	AWV 12/13/11  Yes, UNDP has a staff of three environmental specialists in Mexico with experience on GEF projects who will oversee the project, with support from the UNDP office in Panama. Mexico's UNDAF framework and the UNDP country program both emphasize a focus on building institutional capacity in the areas of environment and sustainable development.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	AWV 12/13/11  Yes - Mexico has a STAR allocation for BD of \$52.8 million, of which about \$49.5 million remains available.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	AWV 12/13/11  There are sufficient resources in the BD focal area to cover this project.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		September 26, 2013  NA.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		September 26, 2013  NA.
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		September 26, 2013  NA.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	AWV 12/13/11  NA	September 26, 2013  NA.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	AWV 12/14/11  Yes, as this project is aligned with BD focal area objective 1, outcomes 1.1 and outcome 1.2.	September 26, 2013  NA.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	AWV 12/14/11  Yes. The project will specifically address the following "sub-objective" under the BD focal area Objective 1, (Improve Sustainability of Protected Area System): "GEF will support the development and integration of adaptation and resilience management measures as part of protected area management projects this support is important to ensure that GEF's investments will continue to contribute to the sustainability of national protected area systems." It will also expand protected area coverage and enhance PA system connectivity.	September 26, 2013  NA.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	AWV 12/14/11  Yes. The project is consistent with Mexico's national development plan. Mexico's NPFE calls for "improved resilience of ecosystems in protected areas in the face of negative impacts such as climate change."	September 26, 2013  NA.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	AWV 12/14/11  Yes, it explains how capacity will be built throughout the system to put in	September 26, 2013  Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>place a readiness framework for addressing the potential impacts of climate change including development of decision-making tools, training of PA managers, and multi-sector financing framework, and enhanced monitoring for climate impact. It will also test cost-effective efforts to enhance resiliency at 12 vulnerable sites and will expand the PA system by at least 600,000 ha, both to create refuge areas as an adaptation response (to accommodate spatial migration of species) and increase connectivity between protected areas. The project will develop a financial sustainability strategy.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>AWV 12/15/11</p> <p>Yes, the baseline situation of Mexico's national protected area system is adequately described.</p>	<p>September 26, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>September 26, 2013</p> <p>This project breaks new ground in the area of strengthening the resilience and sustainability of protected areas that may be impacted by climate change, therefore, it is a contribution to the long-term sustainability of the protected area system and its capacity to maintain biodiversity.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>AWV 12/15/11</p> <p>Yes, the activities to be financed by the GEF are clearly incremental because this project will represent the first major effort by the authorities enhance the</p>	<p>September 26, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		resiliency of the national protected area system in the face of climate change.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>AWV 12/15/11</p> <p>Yes. The project is comprised of three main components that build on each other and fit together cohesively.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Building a national PA system climate change readiness framework to implement the strategy.</li> <li>2. PA system expansion to protect important refugia;</li> <li>3. PA site management to mitigate specific threats to biodiversity. as an adaptation response.</li> </ol> <p>Both 2 and 3 will be informed by the ECCAP and the emerging readiness framework to implement it.</p>	<p>September 26, 2013</p> <p>Yes, overall an excellent and precise project framework with clear deliverables.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>AWV 12/15/11</p> <p>Yes. The project is based on the assumption that climate change will pose risks to the PA systems, and certain ecosystems in particular. The assumptions about the possible impacts are sound and the methodology ‘to create a system to implement Mexico's Climate Change Strategy for Protected Areas in Mexico (ECCAP) ‘ including decision support tools seems sound.</p>	<p>September 26, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	AWV 12/15/11  The description of socio-economic benefits is adequate. The main benefit is the ability of the PA system to continue to generate ecosystem services for the whole country. Expansion of PAs will specifically take the needs of women into account.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	AWV 12/15/11  Project notes that several large CSOs (WWF, Mexican fauna protection, etc) will be involved in the project.  For CEO endorsement, the project should describe how protected area authorities have consulted with community groups, indigenous peoples, and CSOs that will be impacted by the expansion of existing protected areas and who live near the 12 PA sites that will undertake climate change adaptation and resiliency response measures.	September 26, 2013  Response to GEFSEC comments is adequate.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	AWV 12/15/11  Yes. The project will enable the national PA system to respond to the impacts of climate change.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	AWV 12/15/11  Yes. It specifically mentions the many donor funded PA projects that are relevant to the project. It also will learn from the GEF-SCCF funded project on adaptation concerning Mexican	September 26, 2013  Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		wetlands.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	AWV 12/15/11  Yes, it will be executed by the national protected area authority (CONANP), the national forestry commission (CONAFOR), and the national biodiversity commission (CONABIO).	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		September 26, 2013  There has been some re-arrangement of component activities and thus funding per component but this has not altered the project design since the PIF and is expected during any project design process.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		September 26, 2013  NA.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	AWV 12/15/11  Yes.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	AWV 12/15/11  Yes	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	AWV 12/15/11  The co-financing is very strong, with a GEF:co-financing ratio of 1:4.5.	September 26, 2013  Yes.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	AWV 12/15/11  Yes â€ˆ UNDP is committing \$800,000 in co-financing.	September 26, 2013  Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		September 26, 2013 Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		September 26, 2013 Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		September 26, 2013 Yes. Project has provided extensive and more than adequate responses to the many comments by STAP.
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	September 26, 2013 NA.
	• Council comments?		September 26, 2013 Yes. Project has provided extensive and more than adequate responses to the the Council member comments.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	September 26, 2013 NA.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	AWV 12/15/11 Yes, PIF clearance is recommended because this project will systemically seek to build the climate change resiliency of Mexico's national PA system, which is an important element for any strategy for safeguarding Mexico's biodiversity.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO	AWV 12/15/11	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	<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>September 26, 2013</p> <p>Response to this request is adequate.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		September 26, 2013 Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		September 26, 2013 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*		September 26, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	AWV 12/14/11

		Yes â€™ there are six activities to be undertaken. The \$100,000 of GEF resources will only pay for four of the items. Travel and consultation for will account for a low \$5,000 and \$3,000, respectively.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	AWV 12/14/11  Yes â€™ the GEF will pay for four items essential to the project â€™ (1) GIS analysis of the impacts of climate change on PAs, (2) studies of the biological and ecological impacts of climate change on PAs and their constituent species and ecosystems, (3) development of management strategies for selected protected areas, and (4) development of monitoring and evaluation plans.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	AWV 12/14/11  Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.