



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

GEF ID:	4771		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Enhancing National Capacities to Manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by Implementing the National Strategy on IAS		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4714 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,354,545
Co-financing:	\$24,216,257	Total Project Cost:	\$29,570,802
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Andrew Velthaus	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?	December 13, 2011  Yes, Mexico ratified the CBD in March 1993.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	December 13, 2011  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?	December 13, 2011  Yes - UNDP has implemented several IAS related projects, including the successful project in the Galapagos Islands. UNDP will be able to apply	

\*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)
		many lessons learned from that innovative project to this project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	December 13, 2011 No.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	December 13, 2011 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.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	December 13, 2011 Yes - Mexico has a STAR allocation for BD of \$52.8 million, of which about \$49.5 million remains available.	
	• the focal area allocation?	December 13, 2011 Plenty of resources remain in biodiversity.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	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>	NA	
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>February 14, 2012</p> <p>Yes - this PIF is aligned with the focal area strategy, but as noted in the comment for CEO endorsement, UNDP and the Mexican authorities should verify that the islands on which eradication is to occur are clearly high priority for such eradication.</p> <p>The project sponsors have clarified that an estimated \$360,000 dollars of GEF resources will support eradication of invasive alien species on islands, with an additional approximate \$260,000 supporting post eradication monitoring and evaluation and habitat/species restoration. This is 15% of the allocation of \$2.6 million in GEF funding for component 2. The final project document will need to demonstrate that there are sufficient resources for the main goal of component 2, which is to prevent, detect, and respond rapidly to new IAS introductions.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>The PIF is aligned with the BD Objective 2 in the focal area strategy with regard to the Implementation of Invasive Alien Species Management Frameworks" because the emphasis of the project is on strengthening</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>prevention of the introduction of new IAS and managing or controlling IAS in a cost effective way. However, the control measures for IAS (mentioned in component 2) include the mention that IAS eradication will be funded on some islands but that great caution will be used in undertaking such activities. (A system will be developed to prioritize such eradications "where it is the only viable option and/or more cost effective than continued control and monitoring and where they provide the highest biodiversity return on investment." Such caution is appropriate because BD objective 2 does not mention eradication. The PIF needs to clarify which islands are likely candidates for eradication efforts, what the target species for eradication will be, (this is only clear currently for Guadalupe island), and an estimate of how much of the \$2.6 million in GEF resources, if any, will be used for the eradication activities.</p> <p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>Yes, the project is aligned with biodiversity focal area objective BD-2: improved management framework to prevent, control, and manage invasive alien species (IAS).</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011</p> <p>Yes, this project falls under BD objective 2: to mainstream biodiversity</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors.	
	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?	December 14, 2011  Yes. Mexico undertook a National Portfolio Formulation Exercise during 2011, which was recently completed. This project addresses a priority topic identified by Mexico in its National Portfolio Formulation Document - implementation of a national plan for the prevention and control of invasive alien species. The design of the project aligns well with this priority as explained in Mexico's NPPD. It also addresses Mexico's objectives for protected area project relating to IAS during GEF-5. The project will also address objectives on environment and sustainable development in Mexico's UNDAF agreement and The UNDP Mexico country program.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	January 9, 2012  Yes, the amended PIF and UNDP's responses to the GEF Secretariat (provided in pages 17 through 26 of the PIF clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to sustainability. The PIF and responses clearly explain how the project will build CONABIO's capacity to be able to integrate the efforts on IAS of all relevant national agencies into a cohesive national undertaking under the national IAS strategy. The agriculture,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>forestry, and other relevant agencies have already begun coordinating with CONABIO. On sustainable finance, UNDP has elaborated that Mexico already devotes substantial resources to efforts to combat IAS (about \$400 MN annually), signaling the government's commitment to this area as a priority.</p> <p>December 14, 2011</p> <p>The project will build capacity of environment, protected area (PA), and biodiversity officials to engage on IAS detection, prevention, and management, through a national level component and site level components. But sustainability is not ensured for two reasons. First, it does not adequately integrate biodiversity and environment-focused agencies (e.g. CONAP, CONABIO, etc.) adequately into national-level IAS processes that are led by those in control of import control and phytosanitary and zoosanitary measures (e.g. SAGARPA). So the piecemeal approach does not seem overcome. Second, the PIF does not demonstrate how this effort will be made financially sustainable, both at the national and PA levels. It is not obvious that government budget allocations will increase, and greater specificity is needed in the PIF on what "fiscal and market-based instruments and incentives for IAS control" could be introduced through the project to ensure financial sustainability.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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>January 10, 2012</p> <p>The revised PIF and responses from UNDP have clarified the baseline activities sufficiently, including the activities undertaken by SAGARPA and CONAFOR that are essential to the success of the GEF-financed project, which are now reflected in co-financing for the project.</p> <p>December 14, 2011</p> <p>Yes, the PIF adequately describes the baseline activities on IAS being conducted (at national and local levels), including those undertaken by entities like SAGARPA and CONAFOR aimed to combat IAS in economically important sectors. These baseline activities are not included in the co-financing totals and we encourage that they be listed. (see #25 below for further comment.)</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>AWV 12/14/11</p> <p>Yes, the GEF resources will be focused on incremental activities that focus on protecting biodiversity resources from the threat of IAS, and this is clearly incremental to baseline activities and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>projects being undertaken.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>January 10, 2012</p> <p>The revised PIF and responses from UNDP adequately address the concerns mentioned by explaining how efforts at combining IAS in economically important sectors are already being integrated into efforts to implement the 2010 national strategy on IAS, which will be led by CONABIO. These answers clarify the various roles under this strategy, including with regard to enforcement. It clarifies that all relevant agencies are involved in developing the import blacklist of species. Financing of the new approach will be clarified further during project development, but co-financing has already been increased to include important investments being made by the Government of Mexico through SAGARPA and CONAFOR.</p> <p>12/14/11</p> <p>The overall framework of the project (divided between national and site level components) is sound, as is the focus of the project on improving management frameworks to prevent, control, and manage IAS (through strengthen decision-making tools, sectoral guidance and regulations, improved institutional frameworks, and early detection and</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>response systems.) The national-level component has weaknesses that need to be addressed in a revised PIF. It does not adequately explain how the new approach will work with important agencies like customs, SAGAPA, SENASICA and others who play a lead role in control in the introduction of IAS to the country. For example, the PIF mentions that "a blacklist" will be introduced, but it does not mention who will enforce it: surely this will require more than just the PA and environmental authorities to implement. It is also not clear how this enhanced level of effort will be financed, either at the national or site-level (individual PAs and islands).</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>AWV 12/14/11  Yes.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>December 14, 2011  Yes. The project clearly describes the socio-economic benefits of preventing the introduction of IAS. The PIF mentions that attention will be paid to gender equity.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>December 14, 2011  A CSO, Island Conservation and Ecology Group, will be involved in project design and implementation. Some mention is given about how the private sector will be engaged to make them a partner in IAS detection,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		prevention, and management at the national level. But little is mentioned of outreach and education to local communities and CSOs to help prevent IAS introduction (except re: fertilizers, pesticides). This should be explained at CEO endorsement.	
	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)	<p>January 10, 2011</p> <p>The responses from UNDP and the revised PIF respond adequately to the concern expressed below about lack of clarity of what will be done at the national by enforcement agencies to prevent the introduction of new IAS. Enforcement efforts of existing enforcement agencies will be enhanced through improved coordination, creation of a comprehensive black list, and scientific advice from CONABIO.</p> <p>December 14, 2011</p> <p>The project focuses on the risk of climate change as a causal factor for the future dispersion of IAS. The project will model IAS dispersion under different CC scenarios and uses information for IAS management. As mentioned above, however, we do not believe the project adequately addresses the risk of introduction of new IAS at the national level.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>January 10, 2012</p> <p>The revised PIF and responses provided very clearly show how the activities of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this project will be adequately coordinated with other efforts in the country and region. Indeed, the entities involved are already coordinating to prepare for the project and the implementation of the national IAS strategy.</p> <p>December 14, 2011</p> <p>The project is adequately coordinated with other biodiversity-focused by IAS control and management efforts in Mexico, but a revised PIF needs to note how this project will be fully coordinated with other national level efforts on IAS control and management (e.g. important control, SAGARPA, etc.)</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>January 10, 2012</p> <p>The responses from UNDP completely clarify how CONABIO is already working with national-system level agencies on IAS issues.</p> <p>AWV 12/14/11</p> <p>Yes, but further detail will be needed in the PIF and CEO endorsement on how the executing agency (CONABIO) will work with national level agencies to control import/introduction of IAS.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	December 14, 2011  Yes. Management costs are 5% of the GEF grant total, and the same for the co-financing total.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	January 10, 2012  The PIF has been amended to enhance co-financing for the effort by including financing that will be necessary for national level agencies to engage in inspections, import control, and phytosanitary and zoosanitary measures that will be essential to the success of this project.  December 14, 2011  Cofinancing for the national IAS management framework does not seem to be adequate because it does not include the financing that will be necessary for national level agencies engaged in inspections, import control, and phytosanitary and zoosanitary measures.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	January 10, 2009  As mentioned in #24, cofinancing has been increased by \$9 million to reflect important investments being made by SAGARPA and CONAFOR to control the import and spread of harmful IAS in	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>economically important sectors. The co-financing ratio is now 1:4.</p> <p>December 14, 2012</p> <p>This project proposes to deliver \$15.2 million in cofinancing, for a cofinancing ratio of 1:2.84. This seems rather low. In line with the "Guidelines for Project Financing" (GEF/C.41.Inf.04), paragraph 9, the co-financing for this project should include non-GEF "financing associated with the baseline project and any non-GEF financing associated with the incremental project." This project does not include any financing, baseline or incremental, from the private sector, communities, or Mexican authorities concerned with the introduction/import of IAS to the country or sectors, including customs authorities, SAGARPA, and CONAFOR.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>December 14, 2011</p> <p>Yes, UNDP is contributing \$600,000 in cash co-financing.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	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>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>February 14, 2012</p> <p>Yes, UNDP and Mexico have responded fully to the comments below. We note, however, that they will need to fully address the comments in #31 for CEO endorsement, particularly on IAS eradication.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>We are pleased that UNDP has responded adequately to comments 1, 2, and 3 that were submitted in mid-December. But we have two final concerns.</p> <p>1. As noted in #7 above, we have a concern linked to issue 4 below related to the eradication of invasive alien species on some islands. Such eradication is not covered under BD objective 2. In order to move this PIF forward to Council consideration, we request that a revised PIF clarify which islands are likely candidates for eradication efforts, what the target species for eradication will be, (this is only clear currently for Guadalupe island), and an estimate of how much of the \$2.6 million in GEF resources, if</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>any, will be used for the eradication effort on these islands. Please include this information, as appropriate, in the narrative, and in the tables.</p> <p>2. In the table "Project Field Sites - Islands" on page 11, please eliminate rows 3 and 4 as they are duplicates of rows 1 and 2.</p> <p>December 14, 2011</p> <p>No. Further improvements in the following areas are needed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The level of co-financing should be increased, particularly for the national level component.</li> <li>2. Linkages between the activities under this project and baseline national level activities to control the import and introduction of IAS need to be made. It is not clear how the incremental activities will join with the existing system to form a true national strategy on IAS, including all the entities involved.</li> <li>3. Clearer description on how the project will be financially sustainable is needed. What is the likelihood of extra budgetary resources? What are the "fiscal and market-based instruments and incentives" that can be considered at the national and site-level.</li> <li>4. The statement that the average cost of removing IAS on Mexican islands of US\$90/ha is "a return on</li> </ol>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>investment for BD conservation that is one of the highest in the world" needs more comparative data to substantiate it. While for some islands (Macquarie Is., Australia), the per-hectare cost was as high as \$1,900/ha, for the UNDP Galapagos project, the eradication of goats on Isabela Island appears to have cost as little as \$21/ha.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>February 14, 2012</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain in greater detail how financing for implementation of the national IAS strategy will enable implementation of the strategy to be sustainable.</li> <li>2. Eradication of IAS, and related habitat and species restoration and monitoring and evaluation, are projected to use up to a total of \$620,000 in GEF funding, or 24% of component #2. The final document will need to describe both how these efforts are prioritized and that there is sufficient GEF funding to support the core outputs of strengthened prevention, early detection, and rapid response to IAS introductions. These later components should be the emphasis of the component.</li> <li>3. Please specify the level of any GEF funding to be used for eradication efforts, where it will be used, the target invasive species, and the species or ecosystem processes that are being protected.</li> <li>4. Please describe how all associated capture and destruction methods will</li> </ol>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		follow accepted standards of humanely handling and disposing of animals." 5. For the site level projects, describe the plans for outreach to and education and involvement of local communities and CSOs (either on the islands concerned or near the mainland PAs) to help prevent IAS introduction and to eliminate or manage invasive alien species that have been introduced.	
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 15, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2012	
	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?	January14, 2011 Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	January14, 2011 Yes, but UNDP might consider allocating greater resources to the first component

		(baseline and technical analysis of national capacities and needs for integrated IAS management) given the need to ensure that the present piecemeal approach ends.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	AWV 12/14/11 Yes.
	4. Other comments	AWV 12/14/11 No.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 15, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 15, 2012

\* 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.