



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 on 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:	\$25,000	Project Grant:	\$2,283,105
Co-financing:	\$8,429,862	Total Project Cost:	\$10,737,967
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 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	
	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	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.
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)
	• the STAR allocation?	3-17-14 Mexico has a balance of BD \$2,643,012 for this project of \$2,527,375. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	3-17-14 Mexico has a balance of BD \$2,643,012 for this project of \$2,527,375. Cleared	
	• the LDCE under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• 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	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/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	

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)
	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?	<p>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.</p> <p>3-27-14 Cleared</p>	
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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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 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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>03-17-14 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 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>	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>3-17-14 Component 3 and CDI (Stakeholders). Cleared</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>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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3-27-14 Cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-17-14 Please address issues raised under item 6. 3-27-14 Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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. 	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. 3-27-14 Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B	3-17-14 Yes. A project of \$10.3M with \$9.6 cash	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	should be sufficient. Clear	
	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	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3-17-14 Yes. It is 5%. Cleared	
	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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• 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?		
	First review*	March 17, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	
	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.