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

GEF ID:	**10031**		
Country/Region:	**Mexico**		
Project Title:	**Transparency under the Paris Agreement: National and Subnational Contribution and Tracking towards Mexico's NDC**		
GEF Agency:	**IADB**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$45,662**	Project Grant:	**$1,826,485**
Co-financing:	**$1,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$3,326,485**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Gloria Visconti**

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?[1]	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018:It appears so; however, please provide additional information under Part 6. Consistency with National Priorities, making explicit reference to Mexico's	

[1] 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
		NDC, other recent reports to the UNFCCC (NC5 and FBUR) as well as those under development, and the legal and policy background (LGCC, PECC). MGV, May 30, 2018: Comment not cleared. Section 6 on Consistency with National Priorities is showing repeated text from section 5. Please correct with the right text. MGV, June 5, 2018: Comment cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: Description of the drivers of global environmental degradation for Mexico is insufficient. Please expand. MGV, May 30, 2018: This sections has been expanded. Comment cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: a) Please provide further details on Mexico's existing institutional arrangements and capacities to meet the reporting requirements under the UNFCCC and a narrative on how it has developed them to the extent that Mexico can successfully report that information in a timely manner. Please include experiences and insights from participating in the ICA	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		process. This should include the background on the SINACC to provide a better context for the focus of the project. b) Please also expand on the work that is listed in the baseline and cofinancing, in particular that of ICAT, the International Partnership for Mitigation and MRV, the NDC Partnership and the IDB's technical assistance. Further, please add additional details on the IDB's role in Mexico and how this project will work in coordination with that work, to gain a better understanding of the choice of agency and how this project fits in the wider scheme of things. c) Please divide and expand the sections for 4) incremental reasoning, 5) benefits, and 6) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up. MGV, May 30, 2018: All above comments have been addressed. a) Additional information on existing institutional arrangements and capacities has been provided. Comment cleared. b) Information on the baseline and cofinancing work has been added, including the loan from the IDB. Comment cleared. c) Sections 4, 5 and 6 have been	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		separated and more information has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: Currently the project is composed by 7 components. We suggest the project considers organizing into fewer components with several outputs that serve the components' outcomes. a) Please describe how initial scoping activities for the SIAT-NDC will explore the integration or distinction with SIAT-PECC. The conceptual differences between the two remain unclear. b) Please describe how initial scoping activities for the SIAT-NDC will build on or utilize similar studies/activities that have been carried out from the multitude of MRV activities already undertaken to date in Mexico. c) Please clarify the expected scope of the different components of the project even as they will be refined during project preparation: - Will the consultation process involve all states? Will it involve any subnational entities beyond state governments? Which ministries or agencies will it involve? How about non-state actors?	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- What components of the NDC will the SIAT-NDC aim to track? How will it aggregate the subnational indicators into national ones? Will it incorporate a QA and QC process? How will timing be incorporated into its design to meet the timely requirements of the Paris Agreement? - How will the system remain sustainable after the project? How will it be maintained? d) Please include knowledge sharing with other CBIT projects and participation in the CBIT Global Coordination Platform under Component 7. As Mexico is a leader in this topic, we hope it can continue sharing its knowledge and best practices with other countries. MGV, May 30, 2018: The project has been re-organized to only have 3 components and it is much clearer now. a) Comment not addressed. Please provide a response in the review sheet. b) Comment not addressed. Please provide a response in the review sheet.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		c) Comment not addressed. Please provide a response in the review sheet. d) Knowledge sharing with other CBIT projects as well as projects in the region has been added as a component. Comment cleared. MGV, June 5, 2018: All comments have been addressed.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: CSOs are considered under stakeholders. Please expand how gender equality will be taken into account in the project itself as required by the GEF Gender Policy. MGV, May 30, 2018: More information on how the project will consider gender has been added. Comment cleared.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV/JDS, March 30, 2018: Please address comments above and below. Please fix the following on the PIF: a) Under Table A, GEF Project Financing should be $1,826,485 not $2,000,000 (as that value includes the agency fees). b) For easier reading and review, we recommend the agency to use different types of formatting for headings and subheadings and utilize numbered paragraphs. c) Please also consider adding tables to organize the information under the sections on Stakeholders and Risks. d) The requested amount of the PPG seems to have been back-calculated from $50k. Did the author wish to request the full $50k? e) Finally, please carry out a spellcheck through the document as we found several typos. MGV, May 30, 2018: Not yet, please address the remaining comments in Boxes 2 and 5 and below: a) Now table A has 3 extra zeros in	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the column for GEF Project Financing. Please correct. b) Formatting for subheadings have been added. However, the Proposed Alternative Scenario could more clearly outline the Components (e.g. Component 1: Consultation/Diagnostic on MRV at national and subnational level), as well as its associated and numbered Outcomes and Outputs. These numbers could also be added to Table A for greater clarity (e.g. Component 2: SIAT-NDC electornic platform development and validation; Outcome 2.2 Functional SIAT-NDC platform and trained users; Output 2.2.1 SIAT-NDC electronic platform and test results reports, Output 2.2.2 Training sessions for potential users.) This organization would help the development of the full project proposal and overall clarity. c) Table was added for risks, but not for stakeholders. This is OK for now. d) The PPG now has a discrepancy - it is requesting $50,000 and $45,662 in the same table. As no updated OFP Endorsement Letter was provided in this re-submission, we recommend the $50,000 in the top line of the table	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		gets put back to the original $45,662. e) Thank you for editing the document. One further check might help find areas were paragraphs need to be correctly spaced out. In addition, the links provided are quite helpful, but may be better placed in footnotes (i.e. p. 7). MGV, June 5, 2018: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO PIF Approval.	
Review Date	Review	March 30, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] 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.