GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9380**		
Country/Region:	**Mexico**		
Project Title:	**Securing the Future of Global Agriculture Facing the Threat of Climate Change, Conserving the Genetic Diversity of the Traditional Agroecosystems**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-3 Program 7;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,329,452**
Co-financing:	**$36,200,003**	Total Project Cost:	**$41,529,455**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Eduardo Benitez**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	3-7-16 BD-3, Program 7. Aichi Targets 1, 2, 13, 18 & 19. The GEF suggest listing the Targets in order of importance, stating in the text the Target that is the best fit for the project. The reading of the PIF suggests Target 13.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the	3-7-16	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. Page 31-32 of PIF. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	3-7-16 Sustainability. In the PIF, there is reference to the Social, Environmental and Economic Sustainability. Thank you. Please elaborate on who is going to cove the recurrent costs of: i) Databases (COABIO?), and ii) Seed banks after project closure. Provide an estimate of the costs associated with the recurrent costs of these investments so responsible parties are aware of the responsibilities ahead of them. Innovation. The project requires to explain why this particular project is innovative regarding the proposed activities, target geographies and species. In other words, since agro-biodiversity in Mexico has been the focus of so much attention in the past because its prominence from the biological and cultural points of view, what is new about this project? What are the novelties of this project in terms of outcomes and impact on the ground? Are there novelties regarding	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the target cultivars and landraces and how they are going to be protected?	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	3-7-16 The GEF suggests separating the projects that have been completed (the Background information) from the projects that are ongoing and upcoming, which constitute the true "baseline". That is, the projects on which this new GEF project will be building on. That would make easier the articulation of the "Incremental Reasoning".	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	3-7-16 GENERAL It is not clear that a combination of "Capacity Building", "Improvement of Public Policies" and "Valuation of agrobiodiversity and market linkages" will result in the conservation of the genetic diversity of the traditional agro-ecosystems of Mexico. What are the actual investments on the ground that will allow the traditional peasants, indigenous peoples, and local communities to carry-on with the conservation of these resources? The milpas hold the keys for the conservation of agrobiodiversity. What is this project doing for the milpas and its farmers?	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		COMPONENTS 1. The Budget for this component is far too high ($1.6 M) considering that the work at hand is basically the compilation, systematization, and some analysis of information already published for the list of species and its wild relatives on Annex 1. The GEF suggest to re-allocate some of these funds to other components. 2. i) It is not clear why the custodians of Mexico's agro-biodiversity (with hundreds or even thousands of years of on-the ground experience), require "capacity building" for the conservation and sustainable use of plant species including CWRs); i) Are the proposed activities what these local actors have requested? ii) What do the following terms mean in real terms? "A mechanism of self-management", "Stakeholders in participatory genetic improvements"? Iii) The budget for this component ($13.3M) is far too low to tackle activities in 8 target sites ($163,000/site). Either reduce the number of sites or increase the budget. 3. i) The language of the outcome and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		outputs is vague (i.e. "inter-institutional strategy", "synergy mechanism", "Inclusive public policies"), making hard to visualize what will come out of these investments and how these results will actually contribute to achieve the proposed objective. Significantly more precision is needed to understand if these outputs will have "teeth" to make a difference in the conservation of agro-biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge. Ii) What are the existing policies and planning tools that will be subject to "mainstreaming" of traditional knowledge, practices and production systems, as stated in outcome 3.1? The reading of the baseline on the "legal Framework of Agro-BD in Mexico" (p.14) does not allow to visualize how this "mainstreaming will take place. 4. i) Please clarify what "valuation of agro-biodiversity" actually means, and what are the "innovative market incentives" being considered or visualized to achieve the objective of this component and the project. ii) It is not clear why the project has to engage with "value chains" when it has been acknowledged that these species and CRW are traded locally.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Please provide examples of the type of interventions proposed in relation to "market linkages" ii) what are the "innovative financial mechanisms" referred to in outcome 4.1? TARGET SPECIES AND GEOGRAPHIES What is the relationship between the target sites States (Oaxaca, Chiapas, Campeche, MichoacÃ¡n, Chihuahua, Tlaxcala, Jalisco and Mexico City Valley) and species [Maize, beans, amaranth, chilis, squashes, chayotes, green tomatoes, cacao, avocado, nopal, and particular local edible tender leaf vegetables (quelites)]? A matrix with the two variables may allow visualizing how these two important factors relate to each other. It is not clear why the project has selected very well-known species and CWRs (i.e. Maiz) when on the other hand, most of the agrobiodiversity in Mexico has received very little attention as described in the PIF. CO-FINANCING AND STAKEHOLDERS Do the co-financiers know that their names appear in this PIF with an	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		associated $ amount for co-financing in-kind? Please include only those that have agreed at least informally, to co-finance the project and sign a letter of endorsement. In Table 1, there are 12 institutions with mandates and roles in the project. Do all these 12 institutions know they will be participating in the project?	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	3-7-16 Yes. Cleared	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	3-7-16 Yes Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	3-7-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 1, 3, 4 and 5. Thanks. The GEF Secretariat remains available for	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		further consultation on this review. 3-27-16 Yes. This PIF is recommended.	
Review Date	Review	March 08, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		