



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

GEF ID:	9445		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity in Priority Landscapes of Oaxaca and Chiapas		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$7,219,450
Co-financing:	\$47,456,966	Total Project Cost:	\$54,796,416
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 09, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes, project is clearly aligned with Program 1 and Program 9 and the associated Aichi Targets.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Please clearly explain how the project is aligned with the country's revised NBSAP. In addition, please note that the second sentence in paragraph 151 makes no sense and is incomplete.</p>	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes, the project builds on previous experiences in Mexico in implementing a similar conservation strategy. While not particularly innovative, it has been shown to have the potential to be successful and to deliver results at scale.</p> <p>With regards to the project's aspirations inherent in Component Two and outcome 2.2, the project can not develop markets, but can only facilitate an increase in market share for producers. Please clarify this language accordingly throughout the document. In addition, the project is based on an underlying assumption that a market exists. Have any market studies been conducted for the products that will be certified under Component Two? On what basis has the project decided on "destination of origin" as the key certification standard? Does this include biodiversity criteria?</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Para 88 describes a critical element of Component Two, therefore, please explain how this scale and level of effort was arrived at, e.g., two farms, more than 50 hectares, two fishing cooperatives etc. This does not seem to be of sufficient scale to address the problem described in the PIF. Please clarify.</p> <p>CONANP has undergone serious budget cuts and loss of staff. How does the design of this project respond to this current situation from a sustainability perspective?</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes, very well structured project design that identifies barriers to achieving project goal, elucidates a very strong baseline, and what additional investments are needed from GEF to conserve globally significant biodiversity.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Please specify in Table B, under Component One that all new protected areas supported by GEF funds will meet the KBA standard</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which will be officially adopted at IUCN conservation congress this year.</p> <p>Please clarify what is the project basing its targets on in Component Two (20% of areas have adopted "sustainable" production systems). Why 20 and not 40 or 60 or 100? Also please identify what certification standards will be used by the project and for what products? Given Mexico's long experience in this realm, we would expect this to be known at this point.</p> <p>Why has the project identified a 30% increase in financing as desirable? What was the basis for that assessment? Target 3.1.1 includes public and private funding, while Target 3.2.1 includes federal and state which is also public. Please clarify.</p> <p>The PIF makes reference to "innovative finance mechanisms" developed with support from "key decision makers" as being critical for sustaining the landscape land-use plans but these "mechanisms" are not listed in the document, described in any detail, justified as a sound strategy, etc. Please address this gap in the PIF as currently this entire</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>aspect of the project is quite vague.</p> <p>The cofinance from CONAFOR "to support payment for environmental services" and how that relates to the project design in the priority landscapes is not at all clear nor how this relates to the projects emphasis on increasing finance for implementation of the landscape land-use plans. Please elucidate on this aspect of the project design.</p> <p>Why did the project identify 30% as the target for women and vulnerable groups' participation? Is that a value for each or could the project reach the target by having 1% women and 29% vulnerable groups? Please clarify.</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Adequate at PIF stage. At the time of CEO endorsement, particularly given the nature of the project design, please fully develop these aspects of the project and include participation plans and engagement with all stakeholders.</p>	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>			

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	March 18, 2106 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	March 18, 2106 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	March 18, 2106 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	March 18, 2106 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	March 18, 2106 NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 18, 2106</p> <p>No. Please revise as indicated above.</p> <p>Also, please provide better maps of the three priority landscapes.</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 28, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	December 6, 2017  Significant changes have been made to the PIF design but these are acceptable and justifications are sound and they reflect a thoughtful project design process. Cleared.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	December 6, 2017  Yes, the PPG allowed for a more focused design that is less ambitious overall and hence more realistic in terms of expected outcomes and outputs. Cleared.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	December 6, 2017  Yes. Cleared.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<p>4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>December 6, 2017</p> <p>All risks clearly identified but the mitigation measures identified are not adequately explained and all of them require more expansive elaboration. Please revise this entire section and in particular the following risks: a, d, d, e, and h.</p> <p>Please note that the project's mitigation measure for climate change is inadequate. The mitigation measure can not be simply sharing experiences, but rather, please explain how--in the way that the project is promoting ILM--the project intervention will allow for landscape management at a large scale that will potentially buffer impacts of climate change with regards to the conservation objectives of the project.</p> <p>In addition, with regards to the productive activities in agriculture, fisheries and forestry with POs please explain the project strategy vis a vis climate impacts and ensuring climate resilience of productive activities. Here we would expect the project would draw on Mexico's experience in this realm and draw on other GEF projects addressing these issues. Please see comment under question 8.</p>	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		January 4, 2018  Adequate revisions provided. Cleared.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	December 6, 2017  The cofinancing letters are not clear and do not match up with amounts in Table C.  For table C, please use one line for each cofinancier, do not lump them together. Each line should correspond with a cofinance letter. Hence, for example, do not put all the private sector contributors in one line, etc.  Some letters note an amount that will be dedicated annually to the project and this number is presented as the cofinance total (AMBIO), others note an annual amount and this is multiplied by the number of years of the project to come up with the amount in Table C (fundacion Ado).  Please clarify the presentation of the cofinancing letters and eliminate this confusion.  Please note that the sum for Table C is incorrect, that is, when you add the numbers presented, the last digit should be 6 not 7. Please check all your math for the cofinancing to make	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>sure the right number is being presented.</p> <p>January 4, 2018</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided. Cleared.</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>December 6, 2017</p> <p>Yes. Cleared.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	<p>December 6, 2017</p> <p>NA</p>	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>December 6, 2017</p> <p>Yes, adequate project implementation strategy identified however, no plan is provided on how the project will coordinate and cooperate with other initiatives in the region including those of GEF to ensure shared learning given the common thematic and at times geographic nature of these projects. In addition, the same government institutions are implementing many of these projects that have similar approaches and challenges.</p> <p>Please note how the proposed project will coordinate with these GEF projects in particular: PMIS#: 9555, 9380, 5089, 4763, 4207, 3813.</p> <p>January 4, 2018</p>	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Adequate revisions provided. Cleared.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	December 6, 2017  Yes, with a more reasonable set of outcomes, indicators, and targets identified. Cleared.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	December 6, 2017  Yes. Cleared.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	December 6, 2017  NA	
	• STAP	December 6, 2017  Yes, very careful and thorough consideration of STAP comments. Cleared.	
	• GEF Council	December 6, 2017  Yes all comments fully addressed. Cleared.	
	• Convention Secretariat	December 6, 2017  NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	December 6, 2017  No.	

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please address all issues above in a comprehensive way and resubmit.</p> <p>January 4, 2018</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 06, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 04, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		