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

GEF ID:	**5140**		
Country/Region:	**Mexico**		
Project Title:	**Sixth National Communication to the UNFCCC**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4933 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCM-6; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$3,636,364**
Co-financing:	**$4,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$7,636,364**
PIF Approval:	**October 01, 2012**	Council Approval/Expected:	**November 15, 2012**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Rawleston Moore**	Agency Contact Person:	**Raul Alfaro**

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?	Mexico is eligible to receive resources. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The operational focal point has endorsed the project. RM 2012/09/14	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP has comparative advantage for this type of project. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes the project fits into the agency's program in country. UNDP, provides assistance to Mexico under the Country Programme Document (2008-2012)	Same as PIF stage.

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		which was prepared in collaboration with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Sectoral Ministries. RM 2012/09/14	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The resources are available from the STAR Allocation for Mexico. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage.
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	US$500,000 is available from the Focal Area set-aside for this project. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist Mexico to prepare its sixth national communications and biennial update report. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The relevant GEF 5 focal area objective, CCM -6 (support enabling activities and capacity building), is identified. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	The project is linked to the Mexico National Development Plan 2007-2012. Updating the National Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory) and reducing GHG emissions are linked to objective 10 of the development plan. The project is also linked to the Environmental Sustainability Development Policy. RM	Same as PIF stage

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		2012/09/14	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The project will allow the allow Mexico to improve and update its national GHG inventory. There will be the assessment of regional, local and national impacts of climate change. There will be studies prepared in relation to ecosystem, multidimensional and integrated assessment of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation actions, programs and strategies. Knowledge of Low Emission Development Strategies in Mexico will be developed. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage
Project Design	11. 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?	The project responds to a requirement which countries have, to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC. The project consists of the following components: (i) National GHG Inventory (ii) Reporting on mitigation actions, including Low Emission Development Strategies (LEDS) (iii) Vulnerability assessment and adaptation options (iv) Other information relevant to the preparation of the Sixth NC and its correspondent BUR. RM 2012/09/14	Yes, same as PIF stage
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Cost effectiveness for this project has been sufficiently demonstrated.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	The project will assist in preparing the national communications for Mexico and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning. RM	Same as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		2012/09/14	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear. RM 2012/09/14	Same a PIF stage, the project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	The applied methodology for this project is appropriate. RM 2012/09/14	Same as PIF stage.
	16. 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?	Further information on the socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions should be included at CEO Endorsement. RM 2012/09/14	Additional information has been provided on the socio-economic benefits and the gender dimensions.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	A number of government institutions , along with universities and NGO have been identified as stakeholders in the project. Further information on the exact roles of the various organizations should be provided at CEO Endorsement. RM 2012/09/14	Addtional information has been provided on the exact roles of the various organizations in the project.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	The project takes into account potential risks and identifies possible mitigation measures. RM 2012/09/14.	Yes the project takes into account potential risks.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is coordinated with the Mexican Low Emissions Development Strategies and Resilient to Climate Change project, with the Ministry of Energy (SENER). The project is also coordinated with NAMAs preparation, and MRV systems, supported by the	Same as PIF stage

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		European Union, United States of America, UNEP and UNDP. RM 2012/09/14	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation arrangements are adequate. The project will be coordinated by the National Institute of Ecology, which is a decentralized agency of the Mexico's Secretary of the Environment and Natural Resources. RM 2012/09/14.	Same as PIF stage
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes the structure is the same, however the estimated project duration is now 36 months instead of 24 months. Please include in the CEO Endorsement document the new estimated date of submission to UNFCCC, of the 6th national communications. Update 22nd August 2014-RM The new estimated date of submission of the Mexican sixth national communication is to the UNFCCC on December 31st 2016.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The level of funding for project management is appropriate. RM 2012/09/14	The level of project management is satisfactory.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding per objective is appropriate and adequate. RM 2012/09/14.	Same as PIF stage.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	The proposed co-finance is adequate.	The cofinance is adequate, but it is not

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	RM 2012/09/14	required for this type of project.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Further information on the cofinancing by the agency should be provided at CEO Endorsement. RM 2012/09/14	UNDP is no longer providing any cofinancing for this project.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		The tracking tool has been included
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes the proposal includes a budgeted M&E plan.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		Comments from the council have been addressed.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program. RM 2012/09/14	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	The Fifth National Communications of Mexico needs to be submitted to the UNFCCC in order for the project to be CEO endorsed. RM 2012/09/14	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		The project is not yet recommended for CEO endorsement. Please address the issue highlighted in box 21.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Update August 22nd -RM The Mexican sixth national communication is now scheduled to be submitted to the UNFCCC on December 31st 2016. The project is recommeded for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.