



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**

**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening of National Capacities for the implementation of the “Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity.”			
Country(ies):	Mexico	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5738
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5375
Other Executing Partner(s):	SEMARNAT	Submission Date:	1 Dec 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	216,895
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			

## A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-4: Build Capacity on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing (ABS)			GEFTF	2,174,386	8,536,957
		Sub-total		2,174,386	8,536,957
		Project management cost (Including Direct Project Costs: \$15,000)		108,719	401,622
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>2,283,105</b>	<b>8,938,579</b>

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:**  
Enhance in Mexico in a participatory manner, the capacities of national authorities (SRE, SEMARNAT, SAGARPA, CDI, SE<sup>3</sup>), as well as the legal and administrative framework in relation to genetic resources, associated traditional knowledge and benefit-sharing, according to institutional conditions for the implementation of the “Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising From their Utilization to the Convention on Biological diversity ” (NP).

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing(\$)
1. Adjusting the legal framework and establishing public policy measures that regulate the access	TA	1.1. Bill proposal amends the national ABS legal framework	1.1.1.- National Legal Framework Analysis and Diagnosis; of conceptual aspects and technical and operative aspects to determine the scope and interpretation of the standards in effect, determine gaps and	GEF TF	488,886	412,026

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

<sup>3</sup> SRE: Ministry of Foreign Affairs; SEMARNAT: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources; SAGARPA: Ministry of Agriculture Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food; CDI: National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples; SE: Ministry of Economy; IMPI: MEXICAN Institute of Industrial Property; CONABIO: National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity.

utilization of GR and associated TK arising from the fair and equitable benefit-sharing.			inconsistencies, identify areas of interest of FG Agencies as well as their regulatory needs and objectives to be attained regarding GR.			
			1.1.2. Bill proposal aligns the national ABS framework with the Nagoya Protocol.			
		1.2 At least 60 lawmakers have the capacity to analyze requests to access genetic resources and to negotiate benefit-sharing agreements.	1.2.1. Awareness and training of at least 60 key lawmakers on access to GR and benefit-sharing.			
		1.3. National Strategy for conservation and sustainable use of GR, including associated TK.	1.3.1 Proposal of a Post 2015 National Strategy for conservation and sustainable use of GR, developed and accepted by the stakeholders,			
2. Strengthening of national institutional capacities	TA	2.1.- The national Focal Point and National Authorities have been identified and possess the capacity to execute the NP.  Capacities of national focal point and national authorities on ABS improved by at least 30% as measured by UNDP's ABS capacity development score card	2.1.1.- At least 100 Officers of the National Focal Point and National Authorities (SEMARNAT, PROFEPA, CONANP, SAGARPA, SE/IMPI, SRE, CDI, CONABIO) trained in: a) Legal Instruments (measures and actions) existing in the national framework in effect to comply with NP provisions. b) Application of Good Practices Manuals on the sustainable use and management of genetic resources (GR) to facilitate the implementation of the NP among users and suppliers c) Monitoring the utilization of GR, including different research, development, innovation, pre-commercialization or commercialization stages.	GEF TF	939,155	646,064
		2.2 Inter-institutional mechanisms to facilitate monitoring of access to GR, benefit sharing and compliance with the NP	2.2.1.- Inter-institutional mechanisms to facilitate monitoring of access to GR, benefit sharing and compliance with the NP. These mechanisms include: a) A database with information on access permits (that takes into account the national regulation to comply with the NP) to follow up access requests, which shall be fed by each agency. This database will be related to GR Monitoring and Supervision System and associated Traditional Knowledge (TK).			

			b) Assessment and selection of ABS checkpoints			
			c) Creation of the National Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House in order to comply with Article 14 of the NP.			
3. Protecting traditional knowledge and improving the capacities of indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders to generate social awareness on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, GR and associated TK, as well as benefit-sharing arising from their access and utilization.	TA	3.1. Guidelines for the protection of traditional knowledge associated with GR	3.1.1 Guidelines for the protection of traditional knowledge associated with GR taking into consideration the findings of the “ <i>Consultation on mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge, cultural expressions, natural, biological and genetic resources of indigenous peoples</i> ” <sup>4</sup> , among others.	GEF TF	626,345	7,478,867
		3.2.- Community protocols to facilitate ABS	3.2.1 Community protocols drafted in a participatory manner with indigenous and local communities			
		3.3.- Traditional knowledge <sup>5</sup> catalog	3.3.1 Traditional knowledge registry proposal drafted in a participatory manner with indigenous and local communities			
		3.4 80% of the indigenous and local communities targeted by the program is aware of the TK registry and community protocols	3.4.1 Sensitization and awareness program including training and dissemination material (brochures, trifold leaflets, manuals, posters, etc.) on the importance of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge.  3.4.2 Knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) assessment surveys targeting indigenous and local communities assess their awareness on ABS issues, including the project’s proposal to protect traditional knowledge			
Monitoring & Evaluation					120,000	0
Subtotal					<b>2,174,386</b>	<b>8,536,957</b>
Project Management Cost - PMC (Including Direct Project Costs: \$15,000)				GEF TF	108,719	401,622
Total Project Cost					<b>2,283,105</b>	<b>8,938,579</b>

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

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.cdi.gob.mx/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=85&Itemid=200019](http://www.cdi.gob.mx/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=85&Itemid=200019)

<sup>5</sup> This associated traditional knowledge refers to when the uses of plant and animal genetic resources are known to come from the knowledge originated in the cultures of indigenous peoples and local communities.

Letters confirming co-financing for the project are included.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National Government	CONANP	In-kind	45,000
National Government	DGSPNR	In-kind	198,172
National Government	DGGFS	In-kind	47,000
National Government	DGVS	In-kind	116,738
National Government	PROFEPA	In-kind	16,970
National Government	CONABIO	In-kind	79,482
National Government	SFNA	In-kind	110,688
National Government	UCPAST	In-kind	91,615
National Government	UCAI	In-kind	46,244
National Government	SNICS	In-kind	171,545
National Government	IMPI	In-kind	188,178
National Government	CDI	In-kind	151,205
Bilateral Aid Agency(ies)	GIZ-CONABIO Project	Grant	7,425,742
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	230,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	20,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>8,938,579</b>

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Mexico	2,283,105	216,895	2,500,000
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>2,283,105</b>	<b>216,895</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

#### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	40,000		40,000
National/Local Consultants	320,950	tbd	320,950

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

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>6</sup>**

1. The final project design is aligned to the original PIF; it preserves its main objective, strategy and structure. However, small adjustments were made to the project framework based on analyses and discussions with project partners and key stakeholders during the PPG, aiming to improve precision in outputs and indicators so as to best achieve the outcomes and the overall objective.

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

<sup>6</sup> 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: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

2. 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. In the time between PIF approval and ProDoc submission, Mexico has advanced on preliminary analyses of its legal and institutional framework for ABS such that some of the resources that were originally assigned for this in Outcome 1 have been passed to Outcome 2 to provide strengthened support to capacity development. However, the baseline project and core challenges identified during project preparation are 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: N/A

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

3. This project builds on the considerable advances achieved by GEF investments in Mexican biodiversity to date. The project was identified during the process of the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise as one of the initiatives to help meet Mexico's commitments in the national implementation of the CBD work programs, as well as to generate strategies to face the principle threats to biodiversity identified in Mexico's 4th Report to the CBD. As an integral part of the National Portfolio, the project has natural links with the other initiatives in the Biodiversity focal area, with direct institutional and thematic links with the initiatives such as:

- a) *Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change.*
- b) *Enhancing National Capacities to Manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by Implementing the National Strategy on IAS.*
- c) *Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats.*
- d) *Transforming Management of Biodiversity-Rich Community Production Forests through Building National Capacities for Market-Based Instruments.*

4. The abovementioned national UNDP/GEF projects all have important interventions at the local level in communities (including indigenous) which will provide lessons learned for Outcome 3 of this Project, specifically the development of Community Protocols and the establishment of an Traditional Knowledge Catalog. The Project will coordinate with these projects as necessary based on the identification of target Biocultural Regions.

5. Furthermore, initial assessments made for CONABIO's IAS project (b, above) coincide in IAS being a major threat for species that are important as genetic resources. For example, in northern Mexico, exotic grasses introduced for use as livestock fodder, such as Buffelgrass (*Pennisetum ciliare*), have dispersed rapidly across native ecosystems (including many protected areas), and have substantially replaced native vegetation cover (genetic resources per se) and modified natural fire regimes. Introductions of exotic species for reforestation, soil conservation and windbreaks, such as Giant Cane (*Arundo donax*), Casuarina (*Casuarina equisetifolia*), and Salt Cedar Pine (*Tamarix sp*), have impoverished the diversity of native habitats and reduced the availability of water resources throughout Mexico. Mexico also faces the continuing threat of new introductions, such as the Cactus Mealy Bug (*Hypogeococcus festerianus*), which poses a major threat to several cactus and epiphyte species (important genetic resources in Mexico, many of which with associated TK). Certain productive sectors have been identified as critical pathways

for the introduction of IAS into Mexico. For example, aquaculture has grown rapidly throughout the country and now exceeds the production capacity of both agriculture and livestock; the aquarium trade has expanded since 1993 into an industry with 250 farms in 20 states. In the wildlife sector, the importing of exotic invasive species as pets frequently results in releases of these animals into natural ecosystems, where they compete with and prey on native species, alter food chains and change habitats. In the forestry sector, accidental imports of IAS in forestry products threaten native species and result in damage to forest ecosystems. Through both intentional introductions and accidental escapes, these sectors are responsible for the widespread transmission of parasites and diseases; hybridization; predation; competition for food and ecological niches; and habitat alteration in aquatic ecosystems, resulting in the localized extirpation of native species (native genetic resources) at over 100 sites in Mexico. The goals of the IAS Project are related to the goals of the ABS project, as far as maintaining the native species and the genetic resources that could be accessed and conserved through proper ABS mechanisms.

6. The Endangered Species project (*c*, above) will improve the management effectiveness of existing PAs for the conservation of priority endangered species, through the development of adaptive management frameworks, operational capacities and mechanisms for the participation of local communities, increase their coverage through the incorporation of new PAs and biological corridors, and increase their financial sustainability through the establishment of an Endowment Fund. The experiences gained from working with local communities and the creation of a Fund, could contribute in a positive manner to the ABS Project by providing a firm base to support ABS activities.

7. At the regional level, the GEF-UNEP project *Strengthening the Implementation of Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing Schemes in LAC* concluded during the PPG, however, valuable lessons were learnt in each of the participant countries (Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guyana, Panama, Peru and Dominican Republic) which could contribute to strengthening the national capacities for the development of regulatory frameworks as tools for Prior Informed Consent and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. In particular, the different model contracts are available through the GEF regional project on ABS Capacity Building, and serve as examples for the completion of the Mexican model.

8. At the global level, the GEF-UNDP project *ABS Global Capacity Program Nagoya Protocol - Strengthening human resources, legal frameworks and institutional capacities to implement the Nagoya Protocol* is of great relevance and will be carefully taken into account in the further development of this project and in the delivery of national capacities actions such as training, development of case studies, exchange of information and experiences, and assistance for the establishment and implementation of regulatory frameworks. Coordination mechanisms will include yearly programming and lesson exchanges events and establishing joint advisory committees.

9. Finally, the project's design builds on the experience of other national capacity development projects such as *Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety* and the *National Capacity Self-Assessment* project.

10. All of these initiatives are complementary and should provide opportunities for synergy in the biodiversity portfolio. Notwithstanding the above, it was determined that the coordination mechanisms between the stakeholders participating in the execution of the Project should be generated jointly, taking into account the conditions, interests and needs of such stakeholders. The project will work with current GEF initiatives under implementation to share data and establish coordination mechanisms.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

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

11. Stakeholder participation was emphasized during project preparation through the participation of representatives of government agencies, donors, NGOs, private enterprises and local community groups through formal and informal discussions. Perhaps the most active and influential group in this project is the Inter-institutional committee for ABS, consisting of technical personnel of the main institutions with responsibilities under the ABS theme (SAGARPA, IMPI, SEDESOL, COFEPRIS, SRE, CDI and the Environment Sector: CONABIO, INECC, DGVS, DGFFyS, UCPAST); the Group was coordinated by DGSPNR. 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. SEMARNAT staff facilitated the ABS Capacity Development Scorecard scoring exercises. The project design is fully vetted and stakeholder supported.

12. 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 broad range of stakeholders will be integrated within project inception, planning, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Project management tools such as the project inception, annual work plans, mid-term review, and final evaluation will be made available to all interested stakeholders. The project management office, located in SEMARNAT, will be responsible for catalyzing both formal and informal stakeholder participation.

13. Project activities will engage a wide and complex stakeholder base. Under Outcome 1, national stakeholders will inform the design of regulatory reforms through programs and seminars that facilitate outreach and participation. Under Outcome 2, national and local stakeholders will benefit from numerous training programs that emphasize peer-to-peer communication, participation, and learning. Under Outcome 3, indigenous and local community members will benefit from ABS and TK awareness and engagement activities that set in place lasting participation pathways, i.e. Community/Biocultural Protocols.

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

INSTITUTION / STAKEHOLDER	ROLE / TYPE OF COORDINATION
Ministry of Environment (SEMARNAT)	Federal entity leading the environment sector, responsible for promoting the protection, restoration and conservation of ecosystems, natural resources and environmental goods and services in Mexico, in order to allow their sustainable use and development. Coordinator of conservation and natural resource management initiatives, at both intra- and inter-institutional levels. Implements all the responsibilities related to the Nagoya Protocol National Focal Point, as well as promoting GR agenda among different sectors; establishing regulatory measures on GR and ABS. Overall coordinator of the project.
National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO)	Semi-autonomous dependency of SEMARNAT with responsibility for the management of biodiversity. Provides educational materials; GR data management; remote monitoring of GR; risk analysis. National Focal Point to the Intergovernmental Committee for the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and technical advisor on GR issues. Promotes local governance among specific indigenous and local communities where the GIZ has worked.
National Commission for Natural Protected Areas (CONANP)	Semi-autonomous dependency of SEMARNAT with responsibility to protect and administrate Mexico's Protected Natural Areas. CONANP will issue access permits in PAs. Co-responsibility in the design of the databases and pilot projects.
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food (SAGARPA)	Regulates plant genetic resources for food and agriculture; Co-responsibility in the design of the databases and pilot projects.
Ministry of the Interior (SEGOB)	Federal agency that has authority to coordinate the relationship between the executive and legislative branches at the Federal level, and could eventually issue a law implementing the NP-ABS.
Federal Environmental Protection Agency (PROFEPA)	Law enforcement to protect wildlife.
Mexican Institute of Industrial Property (IMPI)	Protect industrial property rights and promote and disseminate the benefits the IP system. Co-responsibility in the design of the GR monitoring system.
National Commission for the Development of Indigenous Peoples (CDI)	Guide, coordinate, promote, support, foster, monitor, and assess programs, projects, strategies, and public actions to attain integral and sustainable

	development and full enjoyment of the rights of indigenous peoples and communities
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Responsible for the country's foreign policy. Its aim is to expand and deepen the political, economic, cultural and cooperation links with the world's various regions.
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 make its installed capacity available to the Project, guaranteeing the accountability of the project.
Local NGOs	Participants in identifying and conserving/managing GR as well as determining associated Traditional Knowledge, developing Community Protocols and TK Catalog
Private sector	Promotion and support of ABS mechanisms (checkpoints, protocols, catalog); Targeted private business committed to ABS compliance and seeking fair and equitable ABS contracts with local communities in the pilot projects.
Local and indigenous communities	Active participants in identifying GR and determining associated Traditional Knowledge <sup>7</sup> , developing Community Protocols and TK Catalog, as well as the conservation of species of interest regarding GR and/or their habitats.

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):

15. The project will create mechanisms to support the premise that benefits generated by Access to Genetic Resources will be shared equitably with the communities that serve as custodians of these GR. These ABS mechanisms will be designed to ultimately provide resources to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and habitats associated with these GR, as well as generate a source of income for the State and the associated communities, ultimately providing socioeconomic benefits at national and local scales. [The specific mechanisms to provide access to genetic resources in Mexico will be developed through Outcome 2: Developing administrative mechanisms to facilitate access will follow the legal and regulatory framework to be determined as part of Outcome 1 \(Adjusting the legal framework and establishing public policy measures that regulate the access utilization of GR and associated TK arising from the fair and equitable benefit-sharing\). These mechanisms include the procedures and minimal regulatory basis to obtain the PIC, negotiate the MAT and establish the basis for determining the distribution of benefits. These three components are the key support to the contractual basis of the NP.](#)

16. Traditionally the environment sector and the economic/productive sectors work separately and often with opposite visions. Most notable are the extraction programs associated with Forestry and Mining, as well as Agriculture and Fisheries, which are oftentimes incompatible with the traditional “hands-off” conservation approach of Protected Areas and other Biodiversity conservation efforts. The government has developed a vision developed of “bioeconomy” but the country’s potential remains untapped; bioprospecting is infrequent and generally only carried out by academic institutions with no commercial aims, generating no financial benefit for the State or the communities involved.

<sup>7</sup> This associated traditional knowledge refers to when the uses of plant and animal genetic resources are known to come from the knowledge originated in the cultures of indigenous peoples and local communities.



Mexico's biodiversity is a strategic resource for the country because its genetic resources have a high potential for application in industries such as cosmetics, therapeutics, biomedicine, agroindustry, among others. The government's concept of "bioeconomy" would be supported through the development of an appropriate ABS framework and a solid National Strategy and could serve to bridge the gap between sectors that have traditionally operated in a very polarized way. The development of the National Strategy and a regulatory framework consistent with the NP will complement the current actions of the Government to promote sustainable development based on the sustainable use of the country's natural capital as well as the transition to the development of bio-economic projects as prioritized by the current administration.

17. Specifically, the project will support the development of a national ABS regulatory framework that seeks to achieve, *inter alia*, the following: (i) fulfil Mexico's legal obligation to fully implement CBD; (ii) ensure that all bio-prospecting initiatives are legally carried out and the benefits fairly and equitably shared; (iii) encourage the establishment of systems for open exchange of information among key stakeholders; (iv) promote the recognition of TK associated with biological resources; (v) promote recognition of the value of biological resources and diversity and thus drive their conservation and sustainable use, and; (vi) enable custodians of these resources and associated TK to receive benefits and alternative livelihood opportunities.

18. With regards to genetic resources, women play a crucial role in their use and conservation due to their importance in culinary traditions as well as medicinal practices. As such, the issue of land-tenure is of concern as well as the education level to ensure that these key stakeholders are properly considered in Prior Informed Consent (PIC), associated TK, and access negotiations. While the project is not specifically gender-oriented, it will put in to practice equity criteria in contracts and benefit agreements.

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

19. In line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005), the project development team has taken a qualitative approach to identifying the alternative of best value and feasibility for achieving the project objective.

20. The development of a National Strategy (Outcome 1) and the accompanying capacity-building interventions (Outcome 2) are cost-effective measures to ensure an integral ABS framework is in place rather than working on a number of individual local or state-level policies. Given the complexity of ABS, it is more cost-effective for the federal government to determine overarching public policy and its accompanying capacity development; this ensures that the efforts of implementing NP are not lost in determining jurisdiction and innumerable local regulations that would only be applicable at a smaller legal scale. The project (Outcome 3) will also pursue pilot opportunities in targeted Biocultural Regions through collaboration with the GIZ project so as to develop Community Protocols in a cost-effective manner – small-scale initiatives offer large-scale returns and lessons for replication at national scale. Furthermore, by generating social awareness in indigenous/local communities and other stakeholders on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, genetic resources and traditional knowledge associated with these, this component would help reduce the asymmetry between provider and user (social conditions) in the negotiation of mutually-agreed terms for the sharing of benefits derived from access and use of traditional knowledge associated with GR.

21. Cost effectiveness will be monitored as an integral part of the monitoring and evaluation process. The project budget provides for independent financial auditing on a yearly basis.

22. Finally, cost effectiveness is ensured through a prescribed project management process that will seek the best-value-for-money. UNDP rules as well as SEMARNAT rules employ a transparent process of bidding for goods and for services based on open and fair competition and selection of best value and best price alternatives. Procurement will be managed by UNDP in coordination with SEMARNAT to ensure the application of all effective regulations. An independent committee is utilized for all procurement of personnel and selection of contractors.

## **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

23. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Panama. The [Strategic Results Framework Matrix](#) (in Section II) provides impact and outcome indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The ABS Capacity Development Scorecard is going to be used as one of the main instruments to monitor progress. The M&E plan includes: inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly operational reports, a mid-term and final evaluation, etc. The following sections outline the principal components of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities (see the table below). The project's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan will be presented and finalized at the Project's Inception Meeting following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

#### Project Inception Phase

24. A **Project Inception Workshop** will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as well as UNDP-GEF (HQs) as appropriate. A fundamental objective of this Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goals and objectives, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the project's logframe matrix. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise finalize the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project. Additionally, the purpose and objective of the Inception Workshop (IW) will be to: (i) introduce project staff with the UNDP-GEF *expanded team* which will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible Regional Coordinating Unit staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, as well as mid-term and final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget rephasings. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed again, as needed in order to clarify for all, each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase.

#### Monitoring responsibilities and events

25. A detailed schedule of project reviews meetings will be developed by the project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for Steering Committee Meetings, or other relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms and (ii) project related Monitoring and Evaluation activities.

26. **Day to day monitoring** of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinator based on the project's Annual Work Plan and its indicators. The Project Team will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The Project Coordinator will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the Inception Workshop with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this Workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the Annual Work Plan. The local implementing agencies will also take part in the Inception Workshop in which a common vision of overall project goals will be established. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

27. **Periodic monitoring** of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the project local implementation group, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of

project activities. UNDP Country Offices and UNDP-GEF RCUs as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to projects that have field sites, or more often based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Any other member of the Steering Committee can also accompany, as decided by the PSC. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the CO and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all PSC members, and UNDP-GEF.

28. **Annual Monitoring** will be ensured by means of the project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings being the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. PSC meetings will be held at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months of the start of full implementation. The project implementation team will prepare a harmonized Annual Project Report and Project Implementation Review (APR/PIR) and submit it to UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF regional office at least two weeks prior to the PSC for review and comments. The APR/PIR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the PSC meeting. The project proponent will present the APR to the SC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the PSC members. The project proponent also informs the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR/PIR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary.

### Project Monitoring Reporting

29. The Project Coordinator in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process.

30. A **Project Inception Report** will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This Work Plan would include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP-CO or the Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project's decision making structures. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the Annual Work Plan, and including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months' time-frame. The Inception Report will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalized the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to this circulation of the IR, the UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF's Regional Coordinating Unit will review the document.

31. **The APR/PIR** is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for Project Coordinators and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. It also forms a part of UNDP's Country Office central oversight, monitoring and project management, as well as represents a key issue for the discussion at the Steering Committee meetings. Once the project has been under implementation for a year, the CO must complete an APR/PIR together with the project implementation team. The APR/PIR can be prepared any time during the year (July-June) and ideally prior to the SCM. The APR/PIR should then be discussed at the SCM so that the result would be an APR/PIR that has been agreed upon by the project, the executing agency, UNDP CO and the key stakeholders. The individual APR/PIRs are collected, reviewed and analyzed by the RTAs prior to sending them to the focal area clusters at the UNDP/GEF headquarters.

32. **Quarterly Progress reports:** Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF regional office by the project team. See format attached.

33. **UNDP ATLAS Monitoring Reports:** A Combined Delivery Report (CDR) summarizing all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly. The Project Coordinator should send it to the Project Board for review and the Implementing Partner should certify it. The following logs should be prepared: (i) The Issues Log is used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. It will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinator to track, capture and assign issues, and to ensure that all project issues are appropriately addressed; (ii) the Risk Log is maintained throughout the project to capture potential risks to the project and associated measures to

manage risks. It will be the responsibility of the Project Coordinator to maintain and update the Risk Log, using Atlas; and (iii) the Lessons Learned Log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on good and bad experiences and behaviours. It is the responsibility of the Project Coordinator to maintain and update the Lessons Learned Log.

34. As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team will prepare **Specific Thematic Reports**, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

35. Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive, specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national and international levels.

36. Project Publications will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the Project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the Project, in the form of journal articles, multimedia publications, etc. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance, scientific worth, etc. of these Reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and will also (in consultation with UNDP, the government and other relevant stakeholder groups) plan and produce these Publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

37. During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the **Project Terminal Report**. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc. and will be the definitive statement of the Project's activities during its lifetime. 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 activities.

#### Independent Evaluation

38. The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows: An independent **Mid-Term Evaluation** will be undertaken at the mid of the third year of implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards 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, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

39. An independent **Final Evaluation** will take place three months prior to the terminal Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

## Learning and Knowledge Sharing

40. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP-GEF sponsored networks, organized for senior project personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. The project will identify and participate as appropriate, in scientific, policy-based networks that may benefit from the project's lessons learned and/or be of benefit to the project.

41. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identifying and analyzing lessons learned is an on-going process. The need to communicate such lessons is one of the project's central contributions and this will be done at least on an annual basis by producing Biodiversity Experience Notes (BEN). UNDP/GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting and reporting on lessons learned. To this end a sufficient amount of project resources will need to be allocated for these activities.

### **Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget**

<b>Type of M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Budget US\$</b> <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	<b>Time frame</b>
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO, UNDP GEF</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 27,000	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"> <li>▪ UNDP/SEMARNAT/PCU will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 2,000	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"> <li>▪ Oversight by Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ Project team</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 2,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP GEF</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> </ul>	0	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> </ul>	0	Quarterly
Project Steering Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 0	Following Project IW and subsequently at least Quarterly
Mid-term Review, including update of ABS CapDev and ESST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP GEF</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. review team)</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 29,500	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation, including final ABS CapDev and ESST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	Indicative cost : 35,550	At least three months before the end of project implementation

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> <li>▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>		
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PCU</li> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ SEMARNAT</li> <li>▪ local consultant</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 5,250	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ PCU</li> </ul>	Indicative cost: 18,750	Annually
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNDP CO</li> <li>▪ UNDP GEF (as appropriate)</li> <li>▪ Government representatives</li> </ul>	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Annually
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 120,000 (+/- 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)
Jorge Muhlia Almazán	Deputy General Director	SECRETARIAT OF FINANCE AND PUBLIC CREDIT	03/05/2014

**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, Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		January 14, 2016	Lyes Ferroukhi, Regional Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302-4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Project Objective:</b> Enhance in Mexico in a participatory manner, the capacities of national authorities (SRE, SEMARNAT, SAGARPA, CDI, SE), as well as the legal and institutional framework in relation to genetic resources, associated traditional knowledge and benefit-sharing, according to institutional conditions for the implementation of the “<i>Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising From their Utilization to the Convention on Biological diversity</i>” (NP).</p>	1. Status of adoption and/or implementation of a National ABS Policy and related regulatory & institutional framework in compliance with the Nagoya Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No National ABS Policy or framework in place. Some individual laws address specific types of GR access that could be integrated into a national ABS framework.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National ABS Policy<sup>8</sup> approved, and regulatory and institutional frameworks developed and operationalized at a national level</li> </ul>	Official government reports	Coordination mechanisms among relevant stakeholders not generated
	2. Level of institutional and personnel capacity for implementation of the national ABS framework as indicated by an increase in the GEF ABS Capacity Development scorecard <sup>9</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21 out of a possible 69 = 30%</li> <li>Basic to moderate capacity within government agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>44 out of a possible 69 = 63%</li> <li>Improved institutional and personnel capacity indicated by an increase of at least 30% over the GEF ABS Capacity Development Scorecard baseline score.</li> </ul>	<p>ABS Capacity Scorecard at project start, mid-term and end.</p> <p>Annual budgets of relevant institutions</p>	Insufficient funding to continue necessary access to GR regulation after Project end
	3. Status of development and implementation of ABS mechanisms to protect TK associated with GR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no formally established protection mechanisms for TK</li> <li>0 TK registered in TK Catalog; 35 partial records</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines for the protection of traditional knowledge associated with GR</li> <li>61 TK registered in TK Catalog</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines</li> <li>TK Catalog</li> </ul>	Govt agencies and indigenous/local communities unwilling to share information and data

<sup>8</sup> It is expected that the National ABS Law and the National ABS Strategy developed by the project will provide the necessary elements for the adoption of a National ABS Policy by project end.

<sup>9</sup> See Section IV Part VII for the GEF ABS Capacity Development Tracking Tool baseline scores.



Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks/ Assumptions
1. Adjusting the legal framework and establishing public policy measures that regulate the access utilization of GR and associated TK arising from the fair and equitable benefit-sharing.	4. % of Analysis and Diagnosis of National Legal Framework for Genetic Resources and ABS	10% - Preliminary legal diagnosis, no gap/capacity analysis	100% Analysis and Diagnostic Study	Analysis document	Govt agencies unwilling to share information and data
	5. % Advance of Bill proposal to amend the national ABS legal framework per NP	10% - Preliminary discussion points for a proposal	100% - Bill proposal in Congress	Proposal document	Political will to support Bill
	6. # of Key Lawmakers trained on access to GR and benefit- sharing	0	At least 60 <sup>10</sup>	Training/project reports	Low participation and retention
	7. # of financial mechanisms created for ABS	0 No federal ABS funding mechanism exists  0 – No incentive programs for ABS compliance exist	1 Federal ABS funding mechanism for conservation of GR and TK designed and implemented  3 - Incentive programs for user participation in ABS developed and implemented in collaboration with at least 3 major commercial sectors (e.g. agriculture, forest, marine, pharmaceutical, etc.).	Funding mechanism documents  Sectoral agency and organization publications (incentive programs, codes of conduct)	Insufficient funding to continue necessary access to GR regulation after Project end
	8. % Advance of National Strategy for conservation and sustainable use of GR, including associated TK	0% - No strategy; lines of action exist for Natl Devt Plan 2012-18, NBDSAP, SINAREFI, etc.	100% - National Strategy and Action Plan for ABS approved by the federal government and published?	NSAP Documents	Conflicts of interest and different priorities of stakeholders
	9. % Advance of National ABS Policy	0% - No Policy; lines of action exist for Natl Devt Plan 2012-18, NBDSAP, SINAREFI, etc.	100% - National Policy for ABS approved by the federal government and published	National ABS Policy Document	Political will to support Policy
<p>1.1. Analysis and Diagnosis of National Legal Framework, including conceptual, technical and operative aspects to determine the scope and interpretation of the standards in effect, determine gaps and inconsistencies, identify areas of interest of Federal Agencies as well as their regulatory needs and objectives to be attained regarding GR.</p> <p>1.2. Bill proposal aligns the national ABS framework with the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>1.3. Awareness and training of at least 60 key lawmakers on access to GR and benefit- sharing.</p> <p>1.4 Proposal of a Post-2015 National Strategy for conservation and sustainable use of GR developed and accepted by the stakeholders.</p>					

<sup>10</sup> Calculation based on at least 5 lawmakers per Commission in both Houses. The following committees are proposed: Agriculture; Indigenous Affairs; Science and Technology; Environment and Natural Resources; Gender equity; Foreign Affairs, attention to International Agencies and Fisheries.

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks/ Assumptions
2. Strengthening of national institutional capacities	10. Capacities of national ABS implementing agencies, as measured by the ABS Capacity Development Scorecard	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 21/69  3 Strategic Areas to improve <sup>11</sup> :  SA2: 10 - There is limited capacity to implement ABS  SA3: 5 - There is political will but limited awareness among stakeholders  SA4: 3 Information is not readily available	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 44/69  3 Strategic Areas improved:  SA2: 19 - ABS Units established with capacity to implement policy and programmes  SA3: 9 – Stakeholders are aware and engaged in ABS  SA4: 5 ABS framework established to systematize and mobilize information	ABS Capacity Scorecard at project start, mid-term and end.	Low participation and retention  Insufficient funding to continue necessary access to GR regulation after Project end  Coordination mechanisms among relevant stakeholders not generated
	11. Degree of adoption of knowledge on the part of officials	10%	80% officials demonstrate ownership of ABS knowledge	Ad hoc survey at Mid-term after training and End	Low participation and retention
	12. Degree of input from officials regarding the Learning Plan for institutionalization of ABS Policy	0%	80% officials have provided input to improve ABS capacity building programme	Ad hoc survey at Mid-term after training and End regarding quality and applicability of training, recommend changes	Low participation and retention, interest in providing/using feedback
	13. Inter-institutional Genetic Resources Information Exchange Center (GRIEC) established with:	0 GR Information Exchange Center	1 GR Information Exchange Center	GRIEC website	Govt agencies unwilling to share information and data
	a. Database on access permits	No Database	Inter-institutional database established via web-based platform	GRIEC website	
b. ABS checkpoints	No formal checkpoints	ABS checkpoints available on online GR Information	GRIEC website	Coordination mechanisms	

<sup>11</sup> This takes into account prioritizations made by Mexico in 2011 <https://www.cbd.int/abs/submissions/icnp-2/questionnaire-cb/mexico-es.pdf> and in 2015.

SA2 Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes

SA3 Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders

SA4 Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge

			Exchange Center		among relevant stakeholders not generated
	c. National ABS Clearing-House	ABS-CH does not exist	ABS-CH website online with updated information	ABS-CH website	
	14. % compliance with the processing times for Access Permits established under the ABS Instrument <sup>12</sup>	0% compliance, no Instrument exists; <u>Processing times of Access Permits:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research – at least 10 months</li> <li>• Commercial use - at least 10 months</li> </ul>	80% compliance of established Instrument: <u>Processing times of Access Permits</u> (once application/documentation is complete): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research - 25 working days</li> <li>• Commercial use - 180 working days</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genetic Resources Information Exchange Center published online</li> <li>• Approval reports of Access Permits</li> </ul>	ABS Unit not established with adequate resources and capacity
<p>2. 1.- At least 100 Officers of the National Focal Point and National Authorities (SEMARNAT, PROFEPA, CONANP, SAGARPA, SE/IMPI, SRE, CDI, CONABIO) trained and possess the capacity to execute the NP.</p> <p>2. 2.- Inter-institutional mechanisms to facilitate monitoring of access to GR, benefit sharing and compliance with the NP. These mechanisms include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A database with information on access permits (that takes into account the national regulation to comply with the NP) to follow up access requests, which shall be fed by each agency. This database will be related to GR Monitoring and Supervision System and associated Traditional Knowledge (TK).</li> <li>– Assessment and selection of ABS checkpoints</li> <li>– Creation of the National Access and Benefit-Sharing Clearing-House in order to comply with Article 14 of the NP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identification, classification and characterization of genetic resources in Mexico.</li> <li>○ Systematization and dissemination of scientific knowledge generated about GR.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks/ Assumptions
3. Protecting traditional knowledge and improving the capacities of indigenous and local communities and other stakeholders to generate social awareness on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, GR and associated TK, as well	15. % Advance of development and implementation of ABS mechanisms to protect TK associated with GR	0% -There are no formally established protection mechanisms for TK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% - Guidelines for the protection of TK associated with GR</li> <li>• Community protocols to facilitate ABS formally adopted by 12 Biocultural Regions<sup>13</sup></li> </ul>	Guideline document	Biopiracy

<sup>12</sup> The project will support the development and approval of a national legal Instrument for ABS. The type of Instrument (regulation, law, or other) will be determined under Outcome 1. Based on experience with previous Bills, the Instrument is expected to be approved within Year 2 of the project.

<sup>13</sup> There are 23 recognized biocultural regions in Mexico integrated by indigenous and local communities according to: Boege, E. 2009. El reto de la conservación de la biodiversidad en los territorios de los pueblos indígenas, en Capital natural de México, vol. II: Estado de conservación y tendencias de cambio. Conabio, México, pp. 603-649.

as benefit-sharing arising from their access and utilization.	16. Availability and accessibility of ABS information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No formal TK catalog; Partial information and records exist for 35 indigenous groups<sup>14</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TK Catalog established with 68<sup>15</sup> TK records, and systems institutionalized to store and update information on GR and TK; mechanism put in practice via 7 pilots<sup>16</sup> (GIZ)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Protocol documents</li> <li>Consultation report</li> <li>TK Catalog</li> <li>Project reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indigenous and local communities unwilling to include TK in catalog</li> <li>Conflicts of interest and different priorities of stakeholders</li> </ul>
	17. Level of awareness of targeted indigenous and local communities regarding ABS and TK, the TK catalog and community protocols	10% of biocultural regions <sup>17</sup> TBD at project start	80% of biocultural regions; Awareness program regarding ABS and TK implemented in 17 biocultural regions <sup>18</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Surveys conducted at Project Start and End</li> <li>-Awareness program documents</li> <li>-Project reports</li> </ul>	Stakeholders identified not participating in Project activities
<p>3.1. Guidelines for the protection of traditional knowledge associated with GR taking into consideration the findings of the “<i>Consultation on mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge, cultural expressions, natural, biological and genetic resources of indigenous peoples</i>”<sup>19</sup>, among others.</p> <p>3.2 Knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) assessment surveys targeting indigenous and local communities assess their awareness on ABS issues, including the project’s proposal to protect traditional knowledge</p> <p>3.3 Community protocols drafted in a participatory manner with indigenous and local communities</p> <p>3.4 Traditional knowledge catalog proposal drafted in a participatory manner with indigenous and local communities</p> <p>3.5 Systematization of communication strategy and awareness program on TK Catalog and Community Protocols, including training and dissemination material (brochures, trifold leaflets, manuals, posters, etc.) on the importance of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge, exchange of experiences among communities.</p>					

<sup>14</sup> Taking as a reference the Medicinal Indigenous Flora of Mexico developed by UNAM: <http://www.medicinatradicionalmexicana.unam.mx/flora/index.php> This database forms part of the Digital Library of Mexican Traditional Medicine <http://www.medicinatradicionalmexicana.unam.mx/index.php>

<sup>15</sup> One record per Indigenous Peoples according to Boege E. 2009 OP. Cit. To finalize the catalog of 68 indigenous peoples in Mexico.

<sup>16</sup> Number of municipalities developing community protocols with support from CDI/CONANP

<sup>17</sup> There are 23 recognized biocultural regions in Mexico integrated by indigenous and local communities according to: Boege, E. 2009. El reto de la conservación de la biodiversidad en los territorios de los pueblos indígenas, en Capital natural de México, vol. II: Estado de conservación y tendencias de cambio. Conabio, México, pp. 603-649. OP. Cit, 2 biocultural regions have been attended, and 21 remain.

<sup>18</sup> The prioritization will be confirmed by a specific workshop at project start.

<sup>19</sup> [http://www.cdi.gob.mx/index.php?option=com\\_docman&task=cat\\_view&gid=85&Itemid=200019](http://www.cdi.gob.mx/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=85&Itemid=200019)

**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).

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p align="center"><b><u>GEF Secretariat</u></b></p> <p>No pending comments.</p>	
<p align="center"><b><u>Council comments:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Canada</u></b>                      We note that the project has a good level of co-financing, particularly for a Nagoya Protocol capacity-development project. We note that the total cost of the project (\$10.7 million) seems high compared to other Nagoya Protocol capacity-development projects and request justification, to ensure cost-effectiveness of GEF funding. For example, some of the regional and global projects budgeted less than \$100,000 per country, and none exceeded \$1 million per country. A similar project in Brazil (presented in this work program) is budgeting about \$8.9 million (in GEF and other funds), while this project in Mexico, which has a lower population and smaller surface area, is budgeting about \$10.7 million.</p>	<p>The development of a National Strategy (Outcome 1) and the accompanying capacity – building (Outcome 2) are cost-effective measures to ensure an integral ABS framework is in place rather than working on a number of individual local or state-level policies. In order to issue specific ABS legislation it is necessary to increase awareness among stakeholders, especially legislators, federal government officials, indigenous/ local communities, and society in general. By promoting transparent and inclusive discussions, the Project expects to achieve the eventual adoption of a legal instrument to enable Mexico to comply with its obligations to the NP.</p> <p>The project (Outcome 3) will also pursue pilot opportunities in targeted Biocultural Regions through collaboration with the GIZ project so as to develop Community Protocols in a cost-effective manner – small-scale initiatives offer large-scale returns and lessons for replication at national scale. However, many of the potential target communities in the Biocultural Regions are in remote areas, requiring additional resources to reach them and ensure their adequate participation in the project. The investment of the GIZ project ensures extensive on-the-ground interventions that will provide important lessons to guide these Community Protocols, as well as balance this project’s establishment of a functional legal and institutional framework at the national level.</p> <p>Cost effectiveness will be monitored as an integral part of the monitoring and evaluation process. The project budget provides for independent financial auditing on a yearly basis.</p>
<p><b><u>Japan</u></b>                      In Mexico, Japan has been implementing a project “Diversity Assessment and Development of Sustainable Use of Mexican Genetic Resources” since 2013 (the implementation institution of Mexico is National Forestry, Crops and Livestock Research Institute (INIFAP)). In this regard, it would be highly appreciated if UNDP could keep sharing with us information on the progress of this project.</p>	<p>UNDP will coordinate with INIFAP to ensure a fluid exchange of information and lessons learned with Japan’s Project, “Diversity Assessment and Development of Sustainable Use of Mexican Genetic Resources”. The third component of Japan’s Project is particularly relevant to the development of a case of ABS. As such, it could be considered among the options for the pilots of Outcome 3.</p>
<p><b><u>Germany</u></b>                      Suggestions for improvement to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:                      The proposal has been elaborated upon in close cooperation with the complementary Mexican-German project “Governance on</p>	<p>The project document has been corrected per Germany’s comments to reflect that the funding of the project comes from the German Federal Ministry for Economic Development and Cooperation (BMZ) and is implemented by the</p>

<p>Biodiversity - Fair and Equitable Benefit-Sharing Arising from the Use and Management of Biological Diversity,” as described in detail in the project proposal. The approval of the GEF project will create significant synergies in national implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>Germany suggests making the following corrections within the PIF:</p> <p>Page 7, bullet point No 3 and page 8, section 2, second paragraph: The funding of the project comes from the German Federal Ministry for Economic Development and Cooperation (BMZ) and is implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).</p>	<p>Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).</p>	
<p>Pages 2, 3, 4 and Page 9: Within the drafting process it will be necessary to adjust the indicative co-financing amounts on the pages 2, 3 and 4 putting them in line with the contributions described in the table on page 9. Not all activities of the project implemented by GIZ are centered on component 3. The table on page 9 correctly shows that there are also contributions to the components 1 and 2</p>	<p>In Outcome 1, the results of the GIZ project will serve as a point of reference for the analysis and development of the new Mexican ABS legal and institutional framework. These include the systematization of international experiences and identification of different governance models applied in different regions of the world; Comparative legal assessments based on global experiences; Regional comparative analysis on the use of ABS norms for the conservation of high BD value areas; Sectorial guidelines; and Codes of conduct on ABS developed with academia.</p> <p>In Outcome 2, the project will coordinate with GIZ regarding the development of national monitoring and control systems for the use and access to GR and associated TK.</p> <p>In Outcome 3, the Project will use the guides developed by GIZ to facilitate the development of Community Protocols. The KAP assessment at Project start will identify areas to be addressed in the development of an ABS Communication Strategy, and taking into account GIZ efforts in awareness raising and community engagement.</p>	<p><b>ProDoc Strategy, p. 25, 29,32</b></p>
<p><u>USA</u> The United States requests the resubmission of this project. The United States requests that this project be revised and re-submitted to the GEF Council prior to GEF CEO Endorsement to allow the UNDP to respond to our technical comments.</p>	<p>The project documents are being submitted within the timeframe established to ensure all parties have sufficient time to review how the comments respond to the technical comments received.</p>	
<p>We request that the full project proposal be modified to explore the linkage between access to genetic resources and ensuing benefits. Most references to “access” with regards to genetic resources in the current project document refer to the phrase “access to genetic resources regulation” or “monitoring access to genetic resources”. Without access there can be no benefits, and the focus on regulation and monitoring of access to genetic resources instead of facilitation of access is not consistent with the Nagoya Protocol objectives. To be consistent with the Nagoya Protocol, this proposal should be modified to be equally focused on the facilitation of access to genetic resources as to the sharing of benefits arising from their utilization.</p>	<p>The specific mechanisms to provide access to genetic resources in Mexico will be developed through Outcome 2: Strengthening of national institutional capacities. Administrative mechanisms to facilitate access will follow the legal and regulatory framework to be determined as part of Outcome 1 (Adjusting the legal framework and establishing public policy measures that regulate the access utilization of GR and associated TK arising from the fair and equitable benefit-sharing). <a href="#">These mechanisms include the procedures and minimal regulatory basis to obtain the PIC, negotiate the MAT and establish the basis for determining the distribution of benefits. These three components are the key support to the contractual basis of the</a></p>	<p><b>ProDoc Strategy, Outcomes 1, 2 and 3</b></p>

	<p>NP.</p> <p>The measures that are to be implemented by the project include:</p> <p>a) [all Outcomes] create social awareness about how the Protocol contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge as well as in the distribution of benefits derived from access and use.</p> <p>b) [Outcome 3] Community protocols to facilitate access and benefit sharing.</p> <p>c) [Outcome 3] Catalog of associated traditional knowledge (as determined by Indigenous/local communities) in order to protect these resources from misappropriation.</p> <p>d) [Outcome 2] Databases containing information about access rights, in order to track them through the exchange of information; the database will be linked to the monitoring system.</p> <p>e) [Outcome 2] Selection and implementation of checkpoints under Article 17 of the Protocol.</p> <p>f) [Outcome 2] The previous databases will feed the National Clearinghouse which will also be developed with support from this in accordance with the provisions of Article 14 of the Protocol.</p> <p>It is understood that access to genetic resources <i>per se</i> does not mean that there are benefits that could be shared fairly and equitably; in order for there to be benefits, there must be a use of genetic resources, accessed under the terms of Article 2 paragraph c). In this regard, the legal instruments will need to be developed, including provisions of incentives to promote proper access and use of genetic resources, in order to generate profits that are distributed in accordance with the national provisions determined in Outcome 1.</p> <p>Another key method to generate monetary benefits is the marketing of products derived from genetic resources and/or associated traditional knowledge. Mexico notes that the legal procedures associated with marketing could be vital to encourage wider distribution of benefits and generate the link to permit verification and monitoring compliance with the provisions of Nagoya.</p> <p>The project will develop and strengthen the “access” mechanisms and guidelines per the NP, regarding PIC, MAT and Benefit sharing as mentioned in the Outcomes described above.</p>	
<p>We request that the full project proposal be modified to address the relationship between genetic resources and traditional knowledge. Not all genetic resources are associated with traditional knowledge, so these concepts should not be coupled. It is critical to address genetic resources and traditional knowledge</p>	<p>Traditional Knowledge (TK) may or may not be associated with genetic resources. For the purposes of this project, associated traditional knowledge refers to when the uses of plant and animal genetic resources are known to come</p>	<p><b>ProDoc Strategy, Outcomes 1 and 3</b></p>

<p>associated with genetic resources separately, as is done in the Nagoya Protocol.</p>	<p><a href="#">from the knowledge originated in the cultures of indigenous peoples and local communities.</a>  Examples of genetic resources <u>not</u> associated with TK include many marine organisms in Protected Areas, as well as microorganisms such as bacteria and fungi. If users wish to access genetic resources associated with traditional knowledge, they will do so in accordance with the relevant provisions of the national ABS framework developed under Outcome 1 (Adjusting the legal framework and establishing public policy measures that regulate the access utilization of GR and associated TK arising from the fair and equitable benefit-sharing) of this project. Through Outcome 3, the project will strengthen the ABS framework developed in Outcome 1 to comply with Articles 7 and 12 of the NP (TK associated with GR), through the inclusion of: i) the development of community protocol in relation to access to associated TK; ii) minimum requirements for mutually agreed terms to secure the fair and equitable sharing of benefits; and iii) model contractual clauses for benefit sharing arising from the utilization of TK associated with GR.</p>	
<p>In the full proposal, we would like to see attention given to Article 8 of the Nagoya protocol which provides for special consideration of research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. In doing so, it instructs Parties to provide simplified measures on access for non-commercial research purposes. Research contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity is itself a clear and significant global benefit. This proposal neither discusses nor recognizes the need to promote this type of research and is therefore inconsistent with GEF priorities.</p>	<p>The interpretation and implementation of Article 8 (Special considerations) is country specific. During implementation of Outcome 1, UNDP will provide guidance on pros and cons of the modalities for implementing this article addressing three main issues: i) Research and simplified measures on access for non-commercial research purpose, ii) the need of expeditious access to genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of such resources (those related to present or imminent emergencies that threaten or damage human, animal or plant health), iii) consideration of important genetic resources for food and agriculture and their special role for food security.</p> <p>Output 1.2 involves the development of legislation aligned with the Nagoya Protocol, including what Mexico considers appropriate to apply this article in harmony with other provisions that complement national implementation.</p> <p>Output 1.4 will complement this by supporting the elaboration of a proposal of a Post 2015 National Strategy for conservation and sustainable use of GR, and support its promotion and acceptance by key stakeholders.</p> <p><a href="#">Ultimately, through Outcome 2, the project will support the establishment and implementation of simplified and expedited procedures to implement the legal and institutional framework</a></p>	<p><b>ProDoc, Strategy, Outcome 1</b></p>



	<p>devised in Outcome 1 to enable access for research as stipulated in Article 8 of the Nagoya Protocol. As described in Outcome 2, Processing times of Access Permits will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research - 25 working days;</li> <li>• Commercial use - 180 working days.</li> </ul>	
<p>In the full project proposal, we request that the UNDP be more explicit about what can and will be done with GEF funds. As currently drafted, it is not clear how the GEF funds will be used.</p> <p>Furthermore, we request a more robust discussion of what the global environmental benefits will be achieved through this project.</p>	<p>The Project Document provides a full description of how the GEF funds will be used, as found in the Strategy as well as the Budget Notes.</p> <p>With regards to GEB, the actions set out by the project to improve the legal framework in Mexico on ABS, to establish proper coordination and control mechanisms and to bring up the capacities of all relevant stakeholders in the country will have incremental benefits in terms of improved conservation of globally important biodiversity in this megadiverse country. By collaborating with the GIZ which will promote set-asides and improved management in key habitat of critically engendered species, this initiative will also contribute to conserving forest ecosystems and other key hotspot of biodiversity in the country thus contributing to reduce rates of carbon emissions resulting from the loss and degradation of terrestrial and coastal carbon sinks. The cumulative effect of these actions will enable Mexico to protect important biological and genetic resources which have enormous potential for application in a variety of sectors and disciplines, and from which the impact could be global.</p> <p>Over the long-term further global environmental benefits will be incurred through the establishment of a robust legal framework, along with the needed technological and operational efficiencies. This project aims at building capacity to implement the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol. This protocol is the main vehicle to deliver one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity: "...the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies..." The nexus to the global environment benefits is in the implementation of Article 9 of the NP "...direct benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources toward the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of its components".</p>	<p><b>ProDoc Section III Total Budget and Workplan</b></p> <p><b>ProDoc Part II Section 2.4, p. 35</b></p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>20</sup>**

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>
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	21,840.00	17,472.00	4,368.00
WORKSHOP/MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	660.00	44.02	615.98
TRANSLATION SERVICES	2500.00	0	2,500.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>25,000.00</b>	<b>17,516.02</b>	<b>7,483.98</b>

<sup>20</sup> 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.