



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats			
Country(ies):	Mexico	GEF Project ID: ¹	5089
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4956
Other Executing Partner(s):	National Commission for Protected Natural Areas (CONANP)	Submission Date:	December 5, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	524,886
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas (PAs) <i>Indicator 1.1: PA management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool</i> Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management. <i>Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for management of protected area systems as recorded by protected area financing scorecards.</i>	Output 1. New protected areas (4) and coverage (500,000 hectares) of unprotected ecosystems. Output 2. 4 new protected areas (4) and coverage (500,000 hectares) of 13 threatened species. Output 3. Sustainable financing plans (13).	GEFTF	5,250,114	30,257,500
		Sub-total		5,250,114	30,257,500
		Project management cost		275,000	1,592,500
		Total project costs		5,525,114	31,850,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: PAs in Mexico contribute effectively to the conservation of endangered species						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
1. System level frameworks	TA	At least two million hectares in ANP are under improved management (such as	1.1 National level adaptive-management framework to guide cost-effective implementation of endangered species	GEFTF	2,554,000	12,600,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

<p>for operational and financial planning and management consolidated to support the conservation of endangered species</p>		<p>exclusion of livestock and the management of species of importance for ecosystem functionality) that favours the conservation status of 14 selected species (<i>Antilocapra americana peninsularis</i>, <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>, <i>Canis lupus baileyi</i>, <i>Caretta caretta</i>, <i>Chelonia mydas</i>, <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>, <i>Gymnogyps californianus</i>, <i>Lepidochelys kempii</i>, <i>L. olivacea</i>, <i>Odocoileus hemionus cerrosensis</i>, <i>Panthera onca</i>, <i>Phocoena sinus</i>, <i>Tapirus bairdii</i>)</p> <p>Reduction in threats indices for each of the 14 species (e.g. hunting, competition with livestock, disturbance of nesting beaches, loss and degradation of habitat)</p> <p>Policy, institutional and regulatory conditions support the conservation of endangered species, as measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases in capacity indices of PA institutions (CONANPat central and regional levels) related to PA management and the conservation of endangered species: avg CapDev Score 27.2 <p>Availability of funding in a timely manner per biological characteristics and field operations needs</p>	<p>conservation, with a consolidated ecosystemic vision, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Strengthened national level systems for monitoring the populations and conservation status of the target endangered species, current or potential threats, and PA management effectiveness in relation to threat reduction. b) Strengthened GIS system support based on updated and reliable data and traditional knowledge regarding the target endangered species c) Continuous updating of definitions of species conservation priorities, targets, corridors and dispersal areas d) Continuous review of PA management categories, that define permitted species uses and activities in relation to the target endangered species, that motivate and/or are compatible with the effective reduction of threats (e.g. ecotourism) <p><u>1.2 Sustainability and opportune availability of funds for actions for the conservation of endangered species,</u> through the establishment of a revolving fund (the Fund for the Conservation of Endangered Species, FONCER) with</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) technical committee and operational structure ensuring its correct and efficient operation, and b) an open mechanism that allows the increase in the capital of the fund from public or private, national or international funds 			
<p>2. PAs and adjoining priority conservation areas are managed effectively at field level for the conservation of endangered species</p>		<p>Strengthened PA management framework protects endangered species and key habitats in PA, as measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased management effectiveness of 21 key PAs Average METT score: 62% - Stable or increased populations of 14 priority species in 21 PAs (to be confirmed in Year 1) <p>Increase in the area of the target species' natural ranges that is included in PAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 new PAs or biological corridors established covering 100,000ha. <p>Stewardship framework facilitates management of critical habitats in the landscape as buffer areas, as measured by:</p>	<p><u>2.1 Strengthened operational capacities at the level of specific PAs for the conservation of endangered species,</u> allowing the effective combat of threats such as hunting and conflict with livestock (e.g. in the case of wolves and jaguars), competition with livestock for pasture (e.g. in the case of pronghorns), accidental by-catch by fishers and loss or degradation of nesting sites (e.g. with vaquita and turtles), and the application of corresponding management strategies such as ecotourism, livestock herd management and capture and release to restock populations, through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Incorporation of provisions for conservation of specific endangered species into 21 annual programmes of PA operation ii. Implementation of specific conservation plans and emergency actions/protocols for highly threatened species in 21 targeted PAs; 	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>2,696,114</p>	<p>17,657,500</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numbers of landowners and other local community members actively participating in and receiving income and employment benefits from, stewardship programmes that improved the habitat and conservation status of endangered species - Levels of economic incentives provided for the conservation and improvement of habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Specific plans for community involvement in the conservation of endangered species and habitats, in Annual Plans of Operations for PAs iv. Platforms for coordination and linkage with different agencies of the three levels of Government in relation to the conservation of the target endangered species v. Strengthened teams for participatory oversight, involving PA authorities, local and departmental Governments and local communities, to counter threats to endangered species and their habitats in PAs vi. Business plans that make provision for the cost implications of ensuring the effective conservation of endangered species in PAs vii. PA staff development for conservation of endangered species; <p><u>2.2 Improved PA coverage and ecosystem connectivity</u>, through the incorporation of 4 new protected areas or biological corridors based on analyses of coverage gaps, habitat and connectivity needs for endangered species and negotiations with local communities</p> <p><u>2.2 Local communities involved in the management and conservation of endangered species and their habitat</u>, through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Programmes involving landowners and local communities, aligned with existing government programmes, for integrated resource management and productive diversification, generating direct employment in communities and supporting species and habitat conservation; and b) Economic incentives for the conservation and improvement of habitat through the registration of lands with diverse financial instruments including Conservation Management Units (UMAs) for endangered species, Community-based Forest Management and payment for environmental services. 			
Sub-Total				5,250,114	30,257,500	
Project Management Cost				275,000	1,592,500	
Total Project Costs				5,525,114	31,850,000	

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

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	Government of Mexico (CONABIO)	Grant	3,000,000
Other	Espacios Naturales y Desarrollo Sustentable (ENDESU)	Grant	900,000
Other	Espacios Naturales y Desarrollo Sustentable (ENDESU)	In kind	250,000

National Government	Mexican Fund for Nature Conservation	Grant	2,100,000
National Government	National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP) (ANP+PROCER)	Grant	25,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In kind	10,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	590,000
Total Co-financing			31,850,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Mexico	5,525,114	524,886	6,050,000
Total Grant Resources				5,525,114	524,886	6,050,000

¹ 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.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	28,000		28,000
National/Local Consultants	260,000	tbd	260,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (Select)

(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 PIF³

The titles of the Outcomes have been adjusted to emphasize more clearly the focus on systemic versus site-level interventions:

PIF	ProDoc
Outcome 1: System level frameworks consolidated to support the conservation of endangered species in PAs and priority conservation areas	Outcome 1: System level frameworks for operational and financial planning and management consolidated to support the conservation of endangered species
Outcome 2: PAs are managed effectively for the conservation of endangered species	Outcome 2: PAs and adjoining priority conservation areas are managed effectively at field level for the conservation of endangered species

³ 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.

Likewise, Output 1.2 has been moved from Outcome 1 to Outcome 2 as the new Output 2.1 Strengthened operational capacities at the level of specific PAs for the conservation of endangered species, given its focus on site-level interventions.

The PIF originally mentions 13 species in 18 PAs. The ProDoc has been adjusted to 14 priority endangered species, with the inclusion of a sixth turtle species, in 21 PAs. This change was made to increase impact with cost-efficiency in mind. The Priority Management Strategies for Sea Turtles identified for implementation in Output 1.2 will impact all 6 sea turtle species so it makes sense to report on all six. The expansion of 18 to 21 PAs reflects the geographic nearness of several PAs and coincides with the natural distribution of some of the target species. Thus, by implementing similar strategies in nearby PAs, the project will ensure greater impact on the conservation of target species.

With regards to expansion of the area of the target species' natural ranges that is included in PAs, while the PIF mentions the possibility of expanding the boundaries of the Upper Gulf of California and Colorado River Delta Biosphere Reserve to reflect the dynamic nature of the distribution of the remaining populations of the vaquita, the PPG determined this to be unlikely. Rather, the project will explore the possibility of increasing the area in which the use of fishing nets is banned to coincide with current vaquita distribution, and thereby expand safer habitat through this management strategy.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: 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. However, the baseline project and core challenges identified during project preparation were 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: NA

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:

This project will build on the considerable advances achieved by GEF investments in Mexican protected areas to date. Foremost among these have been the four successful national projects implemented by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), aimed at consolidating the national protected areas system through the establishment and strengthening of tools for planning, management and financial sustainability. The bases established by those projects will be fundamental to the success of the current project, as they will provide the framework into which the current project will insert strategies for taking into account the implications of climate change on biodiversity and protected areas and providing for their financial sustainability.

Lessons on practical aspects of PA management learnt from site-specific projects such as "El Triunfo Biosphere Reserve: Habitat Enhancement in Productive Landscapes" and "Biodiversity Conservation in the Sierra Gorda Biosphere Reserve" are incorporated into project design where relevant to species-related threats, such as climate change impacts on biodiversity related to protected areas, communities and coordination with stakeholders. Furthermore the project will share data with the GEF-financed project "Integrated assessment and Management of the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem."

The project will also work with new GEF initiatives currently beginning implementation to share data and establish coordination mechanisms. These include the two latest initiatives submitted by UNDP and the GoM:

CONANP's new initiative on the national PA system resilience to climate change: Initial assessments made for this project are consistent with the need of actions for improving resilience of target species. By improving the management of the 21 PAs, and with the habitat improvement actions envisaged, the project is expected to increase resilience of the PAs and the target endangered species, and ultimately decrease vulnerability to climate change. Details on implementation of such actions proposed will be determined considering the Resilience project, including consultations with its coordination unit, in order to strengthen rather than duplicate efforts.

CONABIO's new initiative to strengthen national capacities to manage, control and prevent IAS: Initial assessments made for this project coincide in IAS being a major threat for species such as Cedro's Mule Deer and Baja California Pronghorn. As in the prioritization made for this project, the most urgent actions for those species include control of IAS and cattle fencing. Details on implementation of the actions proposed in these lines for these two species will be determined considering the IAS project, including consultations with its coordination unit, in order to strengthen rather than duplicate efforts.

The project will also make an effort to establish coordination arrangements with UNEP's initiative to support biodiversity conservation in the Sierra Tarahumara of Chihuahua.

The project's sustainable production systems and biodiversity conservation incorporate a watershed-based vision in different aspects of the design of the project strategy that is complementary to the World Bank's Conservation of coastal watersheds initiative.

The project will coordinate with the World Bank Mexico Mesoamerican Biological Corridor project, which is now being implemented by the Biological Corridors and Resources Coordination Unit (CCRB) at CONABIO. The CCRB is currently working on the conservation and sustainable use of eight corridors in the south-east of the country, in Campeche, Chiapas, Quintana Roo, Tabasco and Yucatan, and is expanding to the state of Oaxaca, ensuring that this project takes into account the objectives and principles of the MMBC project, while at the same time learning from and building upon its achievements in relation to the establishment and management of biological corridors and local participation.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

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. 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. CONANP staff facilitated the METT and Capacity Development Scorecard scoring exercises. The project design is fully vetted and stakeholder supported.

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. Stakeholder committees, in the form of Community Advisory Councils and brigades, will be established at each project site to formalize participation. A much broader 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 CONANP, will be responsible for catalyzing both formal and informal stakeholder participation.

Project activities will engage a wide and complex stakeholder base. Under Outcome 1, national, state, and local level 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. Local community members will benefit from conservation area management planning that sets in place lasting participation pathways.

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

implementation of the project:

Key Stakeholder	Role in the Proposed Project
Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (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, and as such will include lessons learned and key messages in relevant international processes related to endangered species conservation.
National Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP)	Semi-autonomous dependency of SEMARNAT with responsibility for the management of protected areas. Overall coordinator of the project.
Natural Spaces and Sustainable Development (ENDESU)	Conservation NGO, implementing conservation initiatives under coordination by CONANP
Local NGOs	Civil society organizations make an important contribution to the management of protected areas and to obtaining resources. In addition, they will be involved in providing technical assistance for the implementation of the project. They include The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Mexican Fund for Nature Conservation (FMCN), the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the AMBIO Cooperative and Mexican Fauna Protection (PROFAUNA), and members of the Gender and Environment Network (Red de Género y Medio Ambiente). They will be involved as participants in promoting alternative livelihood, rural development and stewardship schemes.
Private sector	Promotion and support of wildlife-based businesses, for example through provision of accommodation, transport and financial services. Direct financial contributions to FONCER under corporate responsibility and fiscal incentive schemes.
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 support substantive project development and will make its installed capacity available to the Project, guaranteeing the accountability of the project.
Local communities	Active participants in wildlife stewardship schemes as provided for in federal legislation; beneficiaries of wildlife-based businesses (e.g. tourism); targets of activities to modify livelihood and resource management practices that are incompatible with the conservation of the target species 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 (LDCE/SCCF):

The proposed project will generate various socioeconomic benefits for the citizens of Mexico, contributing to the goal of enhancing the quality of life for a nation that has been challenged in recent years by natural disasters, rising food prices and high levels of poverty and income disparity. Conservation activities that arrest the degradation of coastal (coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass beds, beaches, etc.), as well as terrestrial ecosystems (forests, grasslands) will produce widespread benefits by increasing the potential for productive economic activities by local communities. Specifically,

Mexico's economy is highly dependent on agriculture and tourism, thus the protection of forests, grasslands, and coastal & marine ecosystems will lead to improved economic revenue, food security and livelihoods. In areas adjacent to and upstream of protected areas, conserving ecosystem integrity and functions will serve to maintain agricultural and forest product-related livelihoods and contribute to overall food security, and will protect communities from flooding, erosion etc.

Direct income generation will be increased for local communities through wildlife-based businesses such as eco-tourism employment (in scuba diving / snorkelling and tour guiding), participating in PA management activities including maintenance, monitoring, research and water quality monitoring, and the sale of souvenirs, food, and craft products. Generation of these socio-economic benefits will loop back to benefit protected areas by i) increasing local interest and support for PA conservation through the demonstration of social and economic benefits (as noted above); ii) by increasing the effectiveness of wildlife-based PA management related activities through the additional participation of local community members; and iii) by generating increased visitation and related income for PAs from visitor and eco-tour fees.

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

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.

The project pilots, in particular, are cost-effective in several ways. The pilot sites were selected using several criteria related to cost-effectiveness, such as co-financing opportunities. Moreover, the sites were selected for their high revenue generation potential, along with their biodiversity significance in the existing PA system. The pilot demonstrations will therefore effectively build capacity, while capturing tangible benefits to biodiversity and thus further increasing the project contribution to capturing global benefits. The pilots serve as cost-effective means of determining the financial feasibility of project results before considering them for up-scaling, not only at the national level, but for other endangered species as well. Furthermore, several species share some or all of the same territory, thus the strengthened capacity and effectiveness in PA management will benefit more than the target species. For example, the Golden Eagle shares habitat and nesting grounds with the California Condor in the Sierra de San Pedro Mártir PA, such that the efforts placed on habitat recuperation will benefit both species, and ultimately have a secondary positive impact on habitat used by other non-target species. The cost information from the pilots will add important information to support the decision to replicate best practices from the project across larger geographic and thematic areas. The Project will also use cost-effective measures, such as the existing Protected Areas Forum, for promotion and sharing of Lessons Learned beyond Mexico to other countries. Hence, the GEF will achieve significant national and international impact with limited funds.

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

Finally, cost effectiveness is ensured through a prescribed project management process that will seek the best-value-for-money. UNDP rules as well as CONANP 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 CONANP ensuring 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:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP Country Office (CO) and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and program advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including: (a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. (b) Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RSC staff vis à vis the project team. (c) Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. (d) The Terms of Reference (TOR) for project staff will be discussed again as needed. (e) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks. (f) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, M&E requirements. The M&E work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled. (g) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit. (h) Plan and schedule Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PSC meeting should be held within the first 2 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Project Implementation Workplan: Immediately following the inception workshop, the project will be tasked with generating a strategic workplan. The workplan will outline the general timeframe for completion of key project outputs and achievement of outcomes. The workplan will map and help guide project activity from inception to completion. To ensure smooth transition between project design and inception, the inception workshop and work planning process will benefit from the input of parties responsible for the design of the original project, including as appropriate relevant technical advisors.

Quarterly: Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Report (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot. Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually (Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR)): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following: (a) Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative); (b) Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual); (c) Lesson learned/good practice; (d) AWP and other expenditure reports; (e) Risk and adaptive management; (f) ATLAS QPR; (g) Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits: UNDP CO and the RSC will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the PSC may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RSC and will be circulated no more than one month after the visit to the project team and PSC members.

Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review during mid-point of project implementation (project months 28 – 29). The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward 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 and terms of reference of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The TOR for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the RSC and UNDP-GEF. This independent expert will be recruited at least six months prior to the planned commencement of the mid-term review. The management response and the review will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term review cycle.

End of Project: An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PSC meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The TOR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the RSC and UNDP-GEF.

The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. 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 results.

Learning and knowledge sharing: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and Visibility Requirements

The project will comply with UNDP's Branding Guidelines, which can be accessed at:

<http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other requirements, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP and the logos of donors to UNDP projects are used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The [GEF logo](#) can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo

Full compliance will also be observed with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"), which can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf.

These guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. These Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements will be similarly applied.

Audit Clause

The project will be audited in accordance with the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

M&E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNDP CO, UNDP GEF SEMARNAT/CONANP 	Indicative cost: 25,000	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"> UNDP/CONANP/PCU will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant 	Indicative cost: 15,000	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
	team members.		
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oversight by Project Coordinator ▪ Project team ▪ CONANP 	Indicative cost: 25,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF ▪ CONANP 	0	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ CONANP 	0	Quarterly
Project Steering Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ UNDP CO ▪ CONANP 	Indicative cost: 0	Following Project IW and subsequently at least Quarterly
FONCER Technical Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Project Coordinator ▪ FMCN ▪ UNDP CO ▪ CONANP ▪ ENDESU 	Indicative cost: 5,000	Quarterly
Mid-term Review, including update of METT and ESSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF ▪ CONANP ▪ External Consultants (i.e. review team) 	Indicative cost: 25,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation, including final METT and ESSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF ▪ CONANP ▪ External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost : 30,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PCU ▪ UNDP CO ▪ CONANP ▪ local consultant 	Indicative cost: 5,000	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ PCU 	15,000 (indicative cost per year: 3,000)	Annually
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP GEF (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Annually
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 145,000 (+/- 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)
Margarita Pérez Villaseñor	Deputy General Director	SECRETARIAT OF FINANCE AND PUBLIC CREDIT	08/15/2012

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		December 5, 2014	Lyes Ferroukhi, Regional Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302-4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
Objective:	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
PAs in Mexico contribute effectively to the conservation of endangered species	Change in policy, institutional and regulatory conditions in support of conservation of endangered species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 0 PAs have adequate operational capacity to implement the PROCER - The opinion of CONANP is not binding for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -21 PAs have adequate operational capacity to implement the PROCER - Proposed amendment to the internal rules of the SEMARNAT such that the resolutions of the EIA reflect the opinion of CONANP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools and guidelines for planning and management of selected PAs Laws or regulations issued Ecological Management Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumption: Available funds are sufficient for covering species' needs. Risk: Procedures for designating new PAs take longer than expected. Organized criminal activities affect safety conditions in target areas. Extreme weather events, Fires, Pests and Invasive species, beyond predicted levels.
	Change in CONANP's financial capacity to address endangered species conservation	0 Revolving fund. Financial resources governed by the norms and procedures of the Ministry of Finance; their availability does not relate to the timing of operational needs at the field level. Other resources are not predictable and/or available with the appropriate timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Revolving fund established (Fund for the Conservation of Endangered Species, FONCER) allowing timely access to resources 14 activities / projects supported by the Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FONCER documents FONCER Committee minutes 	
	# of hectares under improved management in favor of endangered species conservation	0 ha (total PA 25,394,779 ha in 176 PAs)	2,000,000 ha in 21 PAs	Official Gazette; PA documents and other certificates	
	Average METT score of the BD-1 Tracking Tool	62%	72%	METT Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR, and TE	
Outcome 1	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions

1. System level frameworks for operational and financial planning and management consolidated to support the conservation of endangered species	% Development of a National monitoring system for endangered species	<p>0% of the monitoring system developed. A monitoring system does not exist, rather there are individual databases on populations and geo-references.</p> <p>0% GIS system updated and including traditional knowledge regarding the 14 target endangered species</p> <p>0 endangered species' information updated regarding conservation priorities, targets, corridors and dispersal areas</p>	<p>100% of the national system for monitoring the populations and conservation status of the 14 target endangered species developed and operational to reflect current or potential threats, and PA management effectiveness in relation to threat reduction.</p> <p>100% GIS system updated and including traditional knowledge regarding the 14 target endangered species</p> <p>14 endangered species' information updated regarding conservation priorities, targets, corridors and dispersal areas</p>	<p>Monitoring platform</p> <p>Reports of specific species</p> <p>Database system to monitor populations</p> <p>Database with information validated by GIS</p>	Data provided is accurate and sufficient to create a robust monitoring system for decision-making
	Regulatory framework adapted to ensure that CONANP's opinions are binding	Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) are not required to be resolved according to the opinions of the CONANP	Proposed Amendment to SEMARNAT's internal Rules to ensure the opinions of the CONANP are binding in EIA resolutions	Proposed Amendment to SEMARNAT's internal Rules	Institutional timing and political will are in line for the elaboration and adoption of an amendment
	Capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for conservation of endangered species in PAs.	<p>Average scores for Capacity Development Scorecard:</p> <p>CR1: 6</p> <p>CR2: 9</p> <p>CR3: 6</p> <p>CR4: 3</p> <p>CR5: 3</p>	<p>Average scores for Capacity Development Scorecard:</p> <p>CR1: 8</p> <p>CR2: 10</p> <p>CR3: 7</p> <p>CR4: 5</p> <p>CR5: 5</p>	<p>Official Gazette</p> <p>SEMARNAT Reports</p> <p>SEMARNAT annual work plan</p> <p>FONCER reports</p> <p>GEF Capacity Development Scorecard</p>	

		<p>Total: 27</p> <p><u>Areas to be improved⁴:</u></p> <p><u>CR1 Indicator 2:</u> Some PAs have established formal co-management mechanisms.</p> <p><u>CR3 Indicator 9</u> - Most PAs have adequate Management Programs but are implemented partially or not at all due to financial constraints and outdated data.</p> <p><u>CR4 Indicator 13</u> - Capacity and technological needs are identified.</p>	<p>Total: 35</p> <p><u>Specific Improvements:</u></p> <p><u>CR1 Indicator 2:</u> - Co-management mechanisms are formally established in selected PAs.</p> <p><u>CR3 Indicator 9</u> - Management instruments are updated with endangered species conservation priorities and implemented effectively in selected PAs.</p> <p><u>CR4 Indicator 13</u> - Capacity and technological needs are satisfied in selected PAs (personnel and materials as well as the technical capacity to adequately manage conservation priorities of 14 endangered species).</p>	<p>applied at PPG, MTR and TE</p> <p>Updates on conservation priorities of the target endangered species</p> <p>Updated POAs</p> <p>Training questionnaires</p>	
	<p>Availability of funding in a timely manner per biological characteristics and field operations needs</p>	<p>50% funding is available in a timely manner per biological characteristics and field operations needs.</p> <p>0 financial instrument exclusive to endangered species</p>	<p>70% funds for conservation actions are received in a timely manner.</p> <p>1 Revolving fund (Fund for the Conservation of Endangered Species, FONCER) established:</p> <p>a) CT FONCER comprises Govt and Civil Society representatives with operational structure to ensure efficient operation with technical criteria for disbursement of funds</p> <p>b) Revenue streams from alternative resources feed the fund through an open mechanism that allows the increase in capital from public or private, national or international funds</p>	<p>Funding reports of conservation activities</p> <p>FONCER Documentation</p>	<p>Resource availability to invest in endangered species-based BD management practices.</p> <p>Willingness within the GoM to commit funding/resources to endangered species conservation.</p> <p>Natl. & Intnatl. macroeconomic conditions remain stable.</p>

⁴ CR1 Indicator 2: Existence of operational co-management mechanisms; CR3 Indicator 9 - Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process; CR4 Indicator 13 - Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer

Output 1.1 National level adaptive-management framework to guide cost-effective implementation of endangered species conservation, with a consolidated ecosystemic vision					
Output 1.2 Financial framework established to provide sustainable and opportune availability of funds for actions for the conservation of endangered species, through the launch of a revolving fund (the Fund for the Conservation of Endangered Species, FONCER).					
Outcome 2	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
2. PAs and adjoining priority conservation areas are managed effectively at field level for the conservation of endangered species	% implementation of Priority Management Strategies ⁵ for the reduction of threats to each of the 14 target endangered species	0% implementation of Priority Management Strategies for the reduction of threats to each of the 14 target endangered species	100% implementation of Priority Management Strategies for the reduction of threats to each of the 14 target endangered species	Planning and Management Instruments / Guides for 21 PAs: POAs/Conservation Plans / Emergency protocols for the spp. PROCER reports Turtle nesting reports PROVICOM	

5

- A. Control of predators (feral animals)
- B. Management of hydrological conditions (e.g. those required by rabbits and prairie dogs used by Golden Eagle as prey, as well as waterholes for tapir individuals' supply))
- C. Management of livestock/predator conflicts (e.g. hunting of wolves and jaguars due to predation of cattle)
- D. Management of fire in order to improve habitat conditions
- E. Post-release support (e.g. monitoring or complementary food supplies) to individuals/populations
- F. Reduction/management of cattle grazing to reduce competition with target herbivores
- G. Protection of turtle nesting sites
- H. Promotion of sustainable fisheries with local communities
- I. Modification of fishing gear (e.g. turtle exclusion devices)
- J. Promotion of natural regeneration of vegetation needed for biological connectivity
- K. Promotion of benefits to local communities and landowners, based on the presence of species and their sustainable use
- L. Determination of refuge areas for marine species
- M. Promotion of protection of areas under diverse models specified under legislation
- N. Promotion of creation of corridors to maintain biological connectivity

				reports	
	Population of target species maintained and/or increase as a result of improved management of key habitat	Baseline values TBD during Year 1: Baja California Pronghorn Golden Eagle Mexican Wolf Loggerhead Turtle Green Sea Turtle Leatherback Turtle Hawksbill Sea Turtle Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Olive Ridley Sea Turtle California Condor Cedros Island Mule Deer Jaguar Vaquita Baird's Tapir	Populations maintained or increased: Baja California Pronghorn Golden Eagle Mexican Wolf Loggerhead Turtle Green Sea Turtle Leatherback Turtle Hawksbill Sea Turtle Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Olive Ridley Sea Turtle California Condor Cedros Island Mule Deer Jaguar Vaquita Baird's Tapir	PROCER reports Turtle nesting reports PROVICOM reports	
	# of hectares managed according to the connectivity and habitat needs of 14 endangered species.	0 hectares added to PAs based on endangered species range/habitat	At least 100,000 has. added to PAs and biological corridors in collaboration with local communities based on endangered species range/habitat.	Official Gazette; PA documents and other certificates	Consensus among local stakeholders for PA expansion and connectivity
	Management effectiveness of 21 PAs with regards to the conservation of 14 target species	METT Scores: 80 Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado 62 Sierra de San Pedro Mártir 53 Valle de los Cirios 75 El Vizcaíno 67 Maderas Del Carmen 52 Janos 51 Tutuaca 51 Papigochic 68 Calakmul 76 Sian Ka'an 80 Montes Azules 54 Marismas Nacionales 66 Sierra de Abra Tanchipa 48 Chacahua 59 Playa de Tierra Colorada 54 Playa Tortuguera Cahuitán 56 Playa de Escobilla 56 Playa Barra de la Cruz	METT Scores: 90 Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado 72 Sierra de San Pedro Mártir 63 Valle de los Cirios 85 El Vizcaíno 77 Maderas Del Carmen 62 Janos 61 Tutuaca 61 Papigochic 78 Calakmul 86 Sian Ka'an 85 Montes Azules 64 Marismas Nacionales 760Sierra de Abra Tanchipa 58 Chacahua 69 Playa de Tierra Colorada 64 Playa Tortuguera Cahuitán 66 Playa de Escobilla 66 Playa Barra de la Cruz	METT Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR and TE	Continued GoM support for PA management improvement

		69 Playa tortuguera El Verde Camacho 60 Playa tortuguera Chenkán Tulum 60 Rancho Nuevo	79 Playa tortuguera El Verde Camacho 70 Playa tortuguera Chenkán Tulum 70 Rancho Nuevo		
	Stewardship framework facilitates gender- and indigenous -sensitive management of critical habitats in the landscape as buffer areas	<p>0 Stewardship Framework oriented toward social participation, consistent with the monitoring matrix of benefits to BD</p> <p>0% increase of landowners and other local community members participating in and benefiting from stewardship programmes and other economic incentives that improve the habitat and conservation status of the 14 target endangered species:</p> <p>PROCER: 252,648 PROCOCODES: 9,179 PET: 1,547 PROVICOM: 185 PSA: 1,720 Compensations via Livestock Predation Insurance Fund: 29</p> <p>0 Communication strategy, actions and communication tools are currently scattered and insufficient.</p> <p>0 PAs implementing emergency protocols</p> <p>12 POA with strategies for community participation in endangered species conservation</p>	<p>1 Stewardship Framework oriented toward social participation, consistent with the monitoring matrix of benefits to BD</p> <p>10% increase of landowners and other local community members actively participating in and receiving income and employment benefits from, stewardship programmes and other economic incentives that improve the habitat and conservation status of the 14 target endangered species:</p> <p>PROCER: PROCOCODES: PET: PROVICOM: PSA: Compensations via Livestock Predation Insurance Fund:</p> <p>1 Communication strategy to engage key stakeholders and the general public and keep them informed of the actions in the selected PAs.</p> <p>21 PAs implementing conservation plans/ emergency protocols</p> <p>21 POAs with strategies for community participation in endangered species conservation</p>	<p>Minutes from Community Watch Council meetings</p> <p>Agreements with gender and indigenous organizations</p> <p>Mapping of actors in selected PAs</p> <p>Plans for community participation in PA</p> <p>ESSP</p> <p>Portfolio of incentives</p>	Local actors understand the role of conservation measures in reducing social vulnerability.
Output 2.1 Strengthened operational capacities at the level of specific PAs for the conservation of endangered species ensure the effective combat of threats and the application of corresponding management strategies.					

Output 2.2 Improved PA coverage and ecosystem connectivity

Output 2.3 Local communities involved in the management and conservation of endangered species and their habitat through the establishment and operationalization of local committees for the conservation of priority endangered species, as well as participation networks.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Response	Reference
<p><u>GEF Secretariat</u></p> <p>In the final project document, please clarify the following:</p> <p>1. Specifics on which PAs will be created and/or expanded and what are the priority areas for wildlife corridors and what management actions will be undertaken in these corridors.</p>	<p>The areas to be created and/or expanded include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of Pronghorn, the goal is to maintain the baseline 43,000 hectares of habitat free of cattle and predators, and add 10,000 ha. more through the creation of new UMAs in the Baja California peninsula. • An area of 2,577,000 has. of semiarid desert covering six municipalities in northwest Zacatecas has been selected for creating a new Biosphere Reserve related to habitat enhancement for Golden Eagle, with collateral benefits for many other species, including jaguar and even Mexican wolf. • The creation of an ecological corridor is envisaged for the protection of the Ecological Corridor of Eastern Sierra Madre (Corredor Ecológico de la Sierra Madre Oriental, CESMO), and would cover the Sierra de Abra Tanchipa Biosphere Reserve, San Luis Potosí; Los Mármoles National Park, Hidalgo; the Necaxa river hydrographic basin; and the Sierra Gorda Biosphere Reserve, in Querétaro. 	<p>ProDoc Section I, Part II, Output 2.1</p>
<p>2. Expected efforts to be taken to reduce by-catch of Vaquita by the fishing industry in the Sea of Cortez.</p>	<p>The project will build on progress made in the framework of both the Program for the Protection of the Vaquita and the Vaquita PACE by facilitating the decrease in the number of gillnets operating in the Upper Gulf of California. The project's goal is to bring gillnet numbers down by at least 60% by the end of the project by supporting either the retirement of fishermen or their transit to alternative livelihoods such as activities in the services sector, i.e. internet cafes, nature-based tourism businesses. The project will also develop and implement a technology transfer program in the Upper Gulf of California for "Swedish nets," or traps, that are harmless to the vaquita.</p>	<p>ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub-section 2.2, Output 1.2</p>
<p>3. We understand that the Mexican government is considering reintroduction of the Mexican wolf. Should the government take an affirmative decision in this direction, the final project proposal should note that GEF funding will not be used for the reintroduction, but should be limited to improved protected area management. If the government decides not to reintroduce the wolf, then the species should be dropped from the proposal as the GEF</p>	<p>GEF funding will not be used for the reintroduction of the Mexican Wolf, rather it will be used to improved PA management and engage local communities in conservation and habitat management activities, thereby creating optimal conditions for the survival of reintroduced individuals and their wild-born pups (the</p>	<p>ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub-section 2.2, Output 1.2</p>

does not fund ex situ conservation.	first of which were recorded in May 2014). The project has applied this same focus to actions regarding the California Condor. As such, indicators of both wolf and condor related to the reintroduction of species have been removed.	
4. Plans and mechanisms to be employed to reduce human-wildlife conflict related to: jaguar (and possibly Mexican wolf) (e.g. measures to reduce predation and retaliation for after incidents of predation) and Baja pronghorn (competition for grazing).	<p>The project will support the implementation of mechanisms that are key in reducing human-wildlife conflict related to Jaguar (and possibly Mexican wolf) with regards to predation and retaliation after incidents of predation, as well as Baja pronghorn with regards to competition for grazing.</p> <p>The “Predator’s Insurance for Livestock” is a mechanism currently under implementation that is showing positive results toward reducing human-wildlife conflict related to predators. The GEF project will help to improve the capacity of the PAs to implement this insurance mechanism with local ranchers affected by wolf predation on their livestock.</p> <p>PES (Payment for Environmental Services), and other instruments based on community involvement, will help to reduce the problem of pronghorn competition for grazing with livestock and increase general coexistence among wildlife and producers.</p>	ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub- section 2.2
5. Efforts to prevent/reduce lead poisoning of California condor in Mexico. (This is the largest threat to wild condor populations in the United States).	The PROCER, through the PACE for Condor, is implementing lead monitoring in wild animals and will implement environmental education in communities to address this problem. The project will complement this effort through actions related to complementary food supply and monitoring of lead levels in condors’ blood, for all captive, reintroduced and wild individuals. Domestic animals (cattle, horses and rabbits) are fed with a balanced diet for weeks before sacrifice and feeding them to the condors. Also, carcasses found by the Park’s personnel on roads or in the field are scanned for lead content and, if found to be lead free, fed to the condors. Ensuring a safe and balanced diet adds to the condors’ survival rates. This will be complemented by the continuity of an observation routine of the animals’ behavior that has been put in place to record food consumption levels and weight variation during acclimatization, pre-release and release.	ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub- section 2.2, Output 1.2

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>STAP</u></p> <p>STAP has only minor suggestions to take into account in preparing full project document:</p> <p>1. The establishment of baselines, targets and indicators of success for each of the twelve species and other biophysical and socio-economic objectives would be essential. This is already described in the PPG.</p>	<p>The Strategic Results Framework provides baselines and targets of project indicators for each of the 14 species as well as biophysical (hectares under improved management, and expansion of PAs/biological corridors) and socio-economic objectives. Species-specific population data for baseline and targets will be confirmed during Year 1.</p>	<p>ProDoc Section II</p>
<p>2. Given the strong science base on which this project is founded, STAP would request that references to information sources be cited in the full project document, as an added strength to the proposal.</p>	<p>References are provided throughout the project document.</p>	<p>ProDoc</p>
<p>3. It would be prudent to examine potential importance of key issues associated with chemicals sources and management within and surrounding the overall area in question. Chemicals can move through aquifers and rivers to the coastal areas, threatening all biota along the way. Given the impact of chemicals on fecundity, and that birds with low clutch size and marine species are involved, one should consider examining monitoring of chemical contaminants in the area, and, if possible identify potential point sources within the managed area. Data of chemical levels in bird eggs and marine species might also be examined. Without such consideration, chemical contamination and ongoing chemical stress due to poor chemicals management within or upstream of the area, has the potential to undermine integrity of protection efforts and health of species. Note that chemicals can come from ongoing use (urban and agricultural), poorly managed stockpiles, active and abandoned mines and other sources.</p>	<p>While the issues associated with chemical sources as a potential threat throughout the target species' areas of distribution is not the main objective of this project, the problem is considered in specific strategies (PACE). The issues and threats caused by chemicals are recognized and considered in specific Priority Management Strategies in Output 1.2: lead for California Condor, poison for Golden Eagle and Mexican Wolf and likely in Jaguar. In the case of the California Condor, routine monitoring of lead levels is in place and will be bolstered through the project's Priority Management Strategy in Output 1.2. For Golden Eagle, the corresponding PACE envisages supporting activities directed to determine the effects of pesticides and other toxic chemicals in the survival and reproductive physiology of the species in Mexico, since neither the presence nor the potential effect of such chemicals have been studied in the country.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Project's Priority Management Strategies consider social and community-based actions to be key to reduce the impact of these threats.</p>	<p>ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub- section 2.2</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Germany</u></p> <p>Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:</p> <p>Although the PPG envisages a vast financial sustainability review regarding the new fund for endangered species (FONCER), also economic programs and subsidies in other sectors (most of all the productive sector like fishery, forestry, livestock farming and agriculture, but also the infrastructure sector – including touristic infrastructure) need to be analysed regarding their (negative) impact on the named endangered species. Looking at the complex structure of the underlying causes for the vanishing of the</p>	<p>The mobilization of funds from the municipality and state level is an important point that was not considered in the original project, however its pertinence to specific species' Priority Management Strategy will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis during project implementation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Stakeholder Participation Plan envisions engaging productive sectors, some of which are traditionally viewed as</p>	<p>Section IV, Part V</p>

14 species cited in the PIF, it seems advisable to mobilise further funds on the municipality and federal state level for species conservation -also outside of PAs- and to restructure and reduce perverse subsidies that are threatening their survival.	competitors or adversaries, to identify opportunities to restructure and reduce perverse subsidies/incentives that threaten the survival of certain species. For example, the project will work with CODAPESCA regarding fishing techniques that affect vaquita as well as sea turtles, SAGARPA regarding livestock and farming practices that increase the risks to predator species such as the jaguar and wolf. The “Predator’s Insurance for Livestock” offers an important opportunity to promote and build upon with respect to incentives for ranchers that are affected by or perceive a risk from wolves and/or jaguar.	
USA This project appears to be comprehensive and methodical. We are particularly pleased to see an ecotourism component, as well as an emphasis on Mexico’s most critically endangered species, included the vaquita. We would like to know, however, what data will be assessed, in addition to the presence or absence of endangered species in the PA system.	In addition to the presence or absence of endangered species in the PA system, Indicators provided in the Strategic Results Framework also consider the establishment of adequate infrastructure, strengthened capacities for management and conservation activities (as measured through the METT and Capacity Development Scorecard), as well as community involvement through committees and brigades.	ProDoc Section II

GEF Secretariat Comments At CEO Endorsement

GEF Secretariat Comment	Response	Reference
...there were two issues raised by the GEF Secretariat that were not sufficiently addressed: 1. Not supporting reintroduction - please be more explicit in the project document that GEF funds will not be supporting costs associated with captive breeding/reintroduction.	GEF funding will not be used for the captive breeding/reintroduction of the Mexican Wolf, rather it will be used to improve PA management and engage local communities in conservation and habitat management activities, thereby creating optimal conditions for the survival of reintroduced individuals and their wild-born pups (the first of which were recorded in May 2014). The project has applied this same focus to actions regarding the California Condor; GEF funding will not be used for the captive breeding/reintroduction of the California Condor. As such, indicators of both wolf and condor related to the reintroduction of species have been removed and instead focus on the improved management of corresponding PAs.	ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub-section 2.2, Output 2.1
2. Lead poisoning in birds of prey - Lead poisoning from consuming animals killed with lead shot as well as the leeching of lead into the environment from the use of lead shot. What will this project do to address this threat? If this threat will not be addressed through project interventions, please explain why not.	The PROCER, through the PACE for Condor, is implementing lead monitoring in wild animals and will implement environmental education in communities to address this problem. Rather than duplicate the PROCER’s efforts, the project takes a	ProDoc Section I, Part II, Sub-section 2.2, Output 2.1

	<p>parallel approach to this issue through actions related to complementary food supply and monitoring of lead levels in condors' blood, for all captive, reintroduced and wild individuals. Domestic animals (cattle, horses and rabbits) are fed with a balanced diet for weeks before sacrifice and feeding them to the condors. Also, carcasses found by the Park's personnel on roads or in the field are scanned for lead content and, if found to be lead free, fed to the condors. Ensuring a safe and balanced diet adds to the condors' survival rates. This will be complemented by the continuity of an observation routine of the animals' behavior that has been put in place to record food consumption levels and weight variation during acclimatization, pre-release and release.</p>	
<p>The outcome indicators under outcome 2 will measure species population levels. However, given that the biological processes of many of these species and the population response (positive, stable, negative) to threat reduction will likely be slow they may not be perceptible or measurable during the life of the project. Therefore, we propose that the project measure the degree to which the main threats to each of these species is reduced or eliminated, as this will serve as a reliable proxy to support the data on population levels that the project plans to record. Please revise the logframe accordingly.</p>	<p>The indicators under Outcome 2 have been revised to include the degree to which the main threats to each species are reduced, thereby providing a proxy to support the data on population levels to be recorded during the project.</p>	<p>ProDoc Section II: Strategic Results Framework</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁶

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$ 99,929			
<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>
ACTIVITY 1: VALIDATION & BASELINES	\$ 24,260.00	\$ 20,300.00	\$ 3,800.00
ACTIVITY 2: ANALYSIS OF CAPACITIES	\$ 36,893.00	\$ 35,715.15	\$ 1,280.53
ACTIVITY 3: DEVELOPMENT OF KEY PROJECT	\$ 38,776.00	\$ 22,833.32	\$ 16,000.00
Total	\$ 99,929.00	\$ 78,848.47	\$ 21,080.53

⁶ 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.