



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

GEF ID:	<b>6952</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mexico</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Implementation of the Strategic Action Program of the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>International Waters</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$300,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$12,900,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$124,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$137,200,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 01, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Christian Severin</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ludovic Bernaudat</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	15th of August 2014: Yes, Mexico is eligible, the other participating nation USA will fund all project related activities out of their national budget(s).	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	15th of August 2014: Yes, Mexico has endorsed the project.  NOAA have signed letter a cofinancing letter as well as an endorsement letter of the SAP, towards supporting activities to the effect that the organisation and hence the US Government will be engaged in the SAPs realisation.	

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	15th of August 2014: Yes the funds are available under the IW focal area	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <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>	15th of August 2014: The suggested activities are not only under IW 3 Program 6, please also include program 5 & 7 (and its associated output indicators in the description of the components).  Further, please revise Table F, as the project will not be addressing 3 transboundary freshwater basins. On the other hand it would be expected that the project delivers on "percentage of fisheries by volume", hence please include that.  25th of August 2014: Addressed	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	15th of August 2014: Yes, However please make sure that the proposed project includes direct reference to the transboundary aspects that the SAP implementation will be addressing.  25th of August 2014:Addressed	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>15th of August 2014 (cseverin): No, In the current write-up the spirit of the transboundary project based on a commitment of both countries and commitments to actions is rather lost. Therefore, please strengthen this aspect both in the overall text and the description of the baseline. Signature of the SAP and commitments to coordinated actions is major achievement that needs to shine through more clearly.</p> <p>25th of August 2014:Addressed</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>15th of August 2014: Please address following points:</p> <p>For component 1, especially the TEST activities, please include also follow-up/upscaling activities to the initial TEST private sector analysis, so that the TEST findings and methodologies can also be applied to other parts of the GoM than the three priority watersheds.</p> <p>Considering that component 3 primarily comes across as capacity building, please lower the amount considerably and move these funds to be more directed towards impacts on the ground (component 1 and 2).</p> <p>Biological Oxygen Demand is abbreviated BOD. Please correct throughout document.</p> <p>The project's outcome 2 should be reformulated as follow "The rebuilding of targeted fish stocks is achieved through</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the implementation of measures, such as the update of the regulatory framework and enforcement, the capacity development, and the monitoring"</p> <p>The comparative advantage of UNIDO on fisheries issues hasn't been demonstrated. We recommend the project to take on board an implementing agency with a clear mandate on fisheries management, as early on in the project preparation phase as possible.</p> <p>25th of August 2014:Addressed</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	15th of August 2014:The Incremental Cost Analysis identifies the GEBs and the incremental reasoning is okay.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?	15th of August 2014: Yes	15th of August 2014 (cseverin): Please at time of CEO Endorsement provide detailed set of indicators to allow for measuring GENDER and CSO involvement in the project, through indicators that are not only # of women involved in mangrove restoration.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient	15th of August 2014: Addressed, however please at time of CEO Endorsement elaborate on not only climate change as the major driver for	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	fisheries degradation in the region, but also unsustainable (over)fishing practices.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	15th of March 2014: Yes	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>15th of August 2014: As the project builds on a regional adopted and ministerial endorsed SAP, the activities proposed is considered to be sustainable and considered to have a high likeliness for upscaling and replication.</p> <p>Addressing the commonly agreed priorities through a Strategic Action program is considered innovative to a LME that to date may have been lacking a coherent approach towards the transboundary issues.</p>	
	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 appropriate and adequate to	15th of August 2014: Yes the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B is considered to be appropriate	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	and adequate to achieve the identified outcomes and outputs.	
	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?	15th of August 2014: The composition is ok, but there is a lack of Private sector financing towards the project. Please explore, during the PPG phase and make sure to include private sector players early in the project development.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	15th of August 2014: YES PM budget is fully inline with the GEF guidance.	
	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?	15th of August 2014: Yes PPG has been requested and the amount is fully inline with the GEF guidance.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	15th of August 2014: NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>15th of August 2014: Please address above comments and resubmit.</p> <p>25th of August 2014: Yes, PIF is being recommended for Work Programme inclusion.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>Please at time of CEO Endorsement include detailed information on the loading from the numerous sources of pollution identified and make sure to also have quantifiable output indicators listing the targets for the investments.</p> <p>Please at time of CEO Endorsement include a strong analysis on the main sources of pollution in the GoM. Industrial pollution is a factor, but it seems questionable that cities and non-point agricultural pollution are not major contributors too. If this is the case, they should be taken into consideration towards implementing the SAP successfully. There are actual commitments in the SAP to decrease municipal discharges which are neither reflected in component 1 or 3, except through constructed wetlands, which seems to primarily target small communities and not major cities.</p> <p>please expand on criteria for prioritizing the industries at the pilot sites (e.g. Is it realistic to tackle such a broad range of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>industries? What is the size and relative loads from thee industries - or what are other criteria for selection?) Being a SAP implementation project, clearer indication of the impact of these measures will be needed at endorsement.</p> <p>Pilot/demonstration type investments are typical the main focus in foundational activities while SAP implementation may still pilot innovative approaches but is also expected to aim at targets for impact/stress reduction.</p> <p>Please at time of CEO Endorsement explain the cross sectoral links that the project will be supporting (eg Inter ministerial committees).</p> <p>Please elaborate a bit on how the demonstrations sites were identified</p> <p>What legal frameworks/legislation will support the on the ground activities? Further, please make sure to link the SAP Implementation to the GPA on LBS and the Protocol under Cartagena Convention.</p> <p>Please develop an output to illustrate the impacts the project will have within the planned Small scale domestic wastewater investments (component 3).</p> <p>Please include gender related activities and inclusion in all components, not only component 3.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>UNIDO is clearly cutting edge as an implementing agency with regards to pollution control and is building on many successful interventions. Yet, we still lack an argument for the comparative advantage of UNIDO within the GEF family of agencies for working on fisheries and marine ecosystem protection/ conservation. Please provide assurance that by CEO endorsement there is a true partnership with another GEF agency in backstopping this project on the side of fisheries. It is not clear why the dialogue with FAO has not matured further.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement: The fishery project target will have to be defined.</p> <p>The component 2 proposal will have to be reformulated. The baseline will have to provide an overview of the situation, with a presentation of the legal frame, the fish stocks trends, the economic and social situation in related countries. The baseline will have to further develop the root causes of fish stocks depletion presented in the TDA. Finally, the baseline will highlight the major past and on-going related initiatives.</p> <p>Please develop clear targets for all components, including Component 2.</p> <p>The pressures on the GoM LME including fisheries seem to be multifaceted and to be including Climate Change, but other pressures also persists,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>such as overfishing, please elaborate on these pressures and their dynamic impact on each other.</p> <p>The outputs will have to focus on addressing the major root causes and be well aligned with the TDA and the IW strategy. Clear definition of the expected project's results will be developed. The role of national executing partners will be specified.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	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.**