



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

GEF ID:	5738		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Strengthening of National Capacities for the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5375 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,283,105
Co-financing:	\$8,938,579	Total Project Cost:	\$11,221,684
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 27, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	3-17-14 Yes. Mexico is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	12-4-15 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3-17-14 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$2,527,375 including Agency fees and PPG. Cleared	12-4-15 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3-17-14 Mexico has a balance of BD \$2,643,012	12-4-15 Cleared

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		for this project of \$2,527,375. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	3-17-14 Mexico has a balance of BD \$2,643,012 for this project of \$2,527,375. Cleared	12-4-15 Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	3-17-14 This project will be funded by Mexico's BD STAR, not NPIF. Please remove mention of the NPIF on Tables A, B and D of PIF Template. 3-27-14 Cleared	12-4-15 Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	3-17-14 BD-4 and Aichi Target 16 (p.7) Cleared	12-4-15 Cleared
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	3-17-14 The project is in line with the Plan Nacional de Desarrollo (2013-2018). Is there reference of ABS in the NBSAP and National Reports to the CBD? Please clarify and cite as appropriate.	12-4-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3-27-14 Cleared	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>3-17-14</p> <p>Under 2) Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects, please remove the 8 point on pages 8 and 9. This information is confusing as the \$ figures do not correspond to the co-financing amounts on Table C.</p> <p>The true "baseline project" (the investments over the next 5 years on which the GEF project will be build on), appears to be the EU 6,000,000 of the collaboration between Mexico and Germany. Nevertheless, based on the information provided on the two paragraphs on page 9, it is not possible to understand if the GEF funds will cover "incremental" or "additional" cost. In order to clarify the relation between the EU and GEF projects, please provide a table presenting the components or activities to be funded by both projects. Table B suggest that most of the EU funds will be used to co-finance Component 3 of the GEF project.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	12-4-15 Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>3-17-14</p> <p>1. Component 1 (Strengthening of national institutional capacities): i) It is not clear if the National Focal Point and National Competent Authority have been</p>	12-5-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>identified, and if the arrangements among the institutions listed under output 1.1.1. Have been established. ii) Are there clear administrative procedures for PIC, MAT and Benefit Sharing? The language used in output 1.1.1 suggests that it is only a matter of training of the Government Officers. Is that the case? iii) What does it mean "Application of Good practices Manuals.....among users and suppliers"? iv) In practical terms, what does "Monitoring the utilization of GR,....or commercialization stages" mean? v) What is the difference among output 1.1.1.c, 1.1.2.a) and 1.1.2.c)?</p> <p>2. Component 3 should be Component 1. Please restrict this component to the "legal framework" and eliminate reference to "administrative measures" (they belong to current Component 1 (to be new Component 2).</p> <p>3. Component 3. If there are \$7.2M in co-financing, what are the GEF's \$0.5M supposed to finance in a field so wide as Community Protocols and Traditional Knowledge Registry?</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>03-17-14</p> <p>The associated GEBs associated with this capacity building project will only become tangible and measurable with the full implementation of the NP.</p> <p>The incremental reasoning needs to be</p>	<p>12-5-15</p> <p>Yes. Pages 35-37 of Prodoc. Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>developed. First, establish the baseline project (i.e. detailed activities to be carried out over the next 3 years, mainly with funds from the Mexico-Germany agreement)., Second, provide the incremental reasoning for GEF resources (i.e. building on what the baseline project will do).</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>12-5-15 Cleared</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>3-17-14 Component 3 and CDI (Stakeholders). Cleared</p>	<p>12-5-15 Yes. Significant engagement with CSOs and indigenous peoples on Component 3 of the project. Cleared</p>
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>3-17-14 A.3 uses boilerplate language. Risk and Mitigation Measures MUST be country-specific. Please clearly state the risks and possible mitigation measures relevant to this project in Mexico.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	<p>12-5-15 Yes. See Table 7, page 35 Prodoc. Cleared</p>
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>3-17-14 Please address issues raised under item 6.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	<p>12-5-15 Yes. This project is particularly well coordinated with the Biodiversity Governance Project funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Development and Cooperation (BMZ) and implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). This 5-year initiative, with a budget of 6 million Euros, began implementation in 2013 as a result of a joint collaboration between the Governments of Mexico and Germany. Cleared
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>3-17-14 Please develop item 6) in PIF. Please address the issues of innovation, and sustainability at the National Level. The GEF expects thoughtful deliberations about the innovative aspects of the project at the National or International level (as appropriate) and what does the project needs to consider to ensure the institutional and financial sustainability of the project. If there is potential for scaling-up, please state.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	<p>12-5-15 There is reference to sustainability and replicability (p.42-43 of Prodoc) but not innovation.</p> <p>2-25-16 Addressed in the revised CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		12-5-15 Yes. Note on this subject was added on p.4 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		12-5-15 Yes. See page 9 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-	3-17-14	12-5-15

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. A project of \$10.3M with \$9.6 cash should be sufficient. Clear	Yes. This project will be funded with significant financial resources of the GEF and Co-financing. Of the \$8.9M in co-financing, \$7.4 are in cash from the GIZ-CONABIO project. The rest comes from 12 Government Institutions and the GEF Agency. Cleared
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	3-17-14 Are all the 9 Government Institutions aware that they are being listed as co-financiers of the project and that a \$ amount appears associated with their names? Please list only that have been consulted and agreed on this matter. The rest can go in the Stakeholder table. No amount provided for UNDP's co-financing. NOTE: In the section B.3. please make reference to the ABS projects where UNDP has served as the GEF Agency. As currently stated, it appears that this is the first ABS project for the agency. 3-27-14 Cleared	12-5-15 On Table C, the contribution of PROFEPA is US \$16,970 and in the LoC it is US \$5,656.5071 (typo with the . ?). The addition of the two values listed in the letter (\$6,818.69 and \$997.73) do not match the co-financing in either US\$ or MX\$. Please enter the correct amount in Table C and/or request a new LoC with the correct amount. Review total co-financing throughout the CEO Endorsement as needed. 2-25-16 New LoC submitted with revised CEO Endorsement.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3-17-14 Yes. It is 5%. Cleared	12-5-15 Please confirm that the GEF OFP understands that from the \$108,719 of PM, \$15,000 will go to UNDP for Direct Project Costs. 2-25-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	3-17-14 The project is requesting only \$25,000. Is that correct? Appears to be little considering the amount of work in a large and diverse country like Mexico. Please confirm. 3-27-14 Cleared	12-5-15 Please clarify the nature of the \$15,172 that in Annex C appear as "amount Committed". Were the Workshop/miscellaneous expenses, translation services and project development cost paid or not? 2-25-16 Cleared
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		12-5-15 No. The Biodiversity TTs for ABS were not submitted. Please refer to the TTs in Excel Format in www.thegef.org 2-25-16 TTs submitted with revised CEO Endorsement Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12-5-15 Yes Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		12-5-15 USA Comments 1. GEF Secretariat suggest answering the question regarding "access" by combining the objective of the three

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>pillars of the Nagoya Protocol: PIC, MAT and Benefit Sharing. Please include the explanation in the text of the CEO Endorsement and Prodoc, as GEF Council members may not reach Annex B or this review sheet. Thanks.</p> <p>2. The reading of the CEO Endorsement continued suggesting the mandatory relationship of genetic resources and TK. The GEF Secretariat suggest screening the text in the CEO Endorsement and Prodoc, and insert text stating that reflects the understanding that these two do not necessarily go together. Something like: "the genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge when the uses of plant and animal genetic resources are know to come from the knowledge originated in the cultures of indigenous peoples and local communities. When resubmitting the CEO Endorsement and to facilitate the review, please indicate the pages where notes of this nature have been included. Thanks.</p> <p>3. regarding "simplified measures on access for non-commercial research purposes". The answer provided to the GEF Council "During implementation of Outcome 1, UNDP will provide guidance on pros and cons of the modalities for implementing this article addressing three main issues:...." is not totally consistent with the Results Framework in Annex A where it says: "Processing times of Access Permits:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Research - 25 working days; Commercial use - 180 working days". It appears that access for research will be simplified and expedited. Please modify as appropriate. 2-25-16 Answers provided in the Response Matrix and in CEO endorsement. Cleared
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	3-17-14 No. Please address issues under items 3,5,6,7,8,11.12,13,17 and 19. Thanks. 3-27-14 Cleared	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		12-5-15 No. Please address issues under 3,17,18,19,21, 23 2-25-16 Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.
	First review*	March 17, 2014	December 05, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	February 25, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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