



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

GEF ID:	6952		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Implementation of the Strategic Action Program of the Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem		
GEF Agency:	UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$12,900,000
Co-financing:	\$124,210,000	Total Project Cost:	\$137,710,000
PIF Approval:	September 04, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	October 30, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Christian Susan,

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 ?	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).	30th of March 2016 (cseverin): the country is still eligible
	2. Has the operational focal point 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.	30th of March 2016 (cseverin): Endorsement still valid
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	15th of August 2014: Yes the funds are available under the IW focal area	30th of March 2016 (cseverin):Funds are still available.
	• 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 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>	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	30th of March 2016 (cseverin): Yes there is alignment between the FA results framework and the project. However, there seems to be discrepancies between the amount inserted in the E, fisheries moved to sustainable levels" and the amount inserted in the IW Tracking tool. please make sure they correspond. 15th of October 2016: addressed
	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?	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	30th of March 2016 (cseverin):Yes

*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.

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)
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>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>	30th of March 2016 (cseverin):Yes, the project has a very strong baseline set of investments, that the GEF funding will built upon and attract serious cofinancing too.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (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>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):</p> <p>Please insert a table of content into the document, it is hard to keep an overview of this large volume, without such.</p> <p>A number of baseline reports have been produced, please attach in their full version. The summary is good, but considering the key impact these reports and their findings need to have in identifying baselines and in informing the activities in the components.</p> <p>As below illustrates there is a great need to revise the RF of the project, to make sure it focused MUCH MORE on the environmental impacts of the investments undertaken in the different components, instead of focusing on how many people will be trained, part take in the activities and what reports will be written. Unfortunately the above focus on number of people trained etc, is an effect of a lack of specificity in the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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>	<p>component description in the main part of the project document. Please make sure that the project component descriptions are much more focused on the interventions that will take place and what impact that these will have on the environment, either directly, or through changes to management practices. Even if the latter, some kind of impact on the environment of the Gulf of Mexico is to be expected.</p> <p>The Outputs listed in table B as well as in the Project Results Framework are too focused on training and how many people will be trained. A project focused on SAP implementation and stress reduction needs to illustrate a larger impact, and not only have outputs listed that focus on training and capacity building.</p> <p>Please make sure to include a mechanism, so that the project will be able to report on and capture the tangible deliverables from the TEST activities. these are only mentioned in passing in the RF. These needs to be much better captured and monitored.</p> <p>Please include wording in the document that ensures the funder that an updated RF, based on Baseline data (and therefore will be featuring much more clearly what the project will be delivering) will be submitted within the initial year of implementation.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Please elaborate on why the 4 pollution hotspots identification (Component 1) will be an output of project. It seems to have already happened during the Preparation of the project.</p> <p>The entire range of targets from output 1.2, is focused on training, please consider revising. An impact from this project can and should not be counted in amount of people trained, but instead focus on long term policy or behavioral changes.</p> <p>output 1.3in the RF is much better formulated and identifies impact, but focuses maybe a bit too much on managerial impacts of the investment, instead out identifying the impact on the environment. Please include pollution loading targets etc.</p> <p>Output 1.4 in RF. To ensure long term sustainability of the investment in Monitoring, please include development of an exit strategy, that will include a roadmap to how these activities (and their cost) will being taken over by the national Authorities.</p> <p>2.1 in RF: talks about Transboundary data exchange. please consider to specific this to be a "transboundary data exchange mechanism" Further, again, the entire sets of targets for this subcomponent is focused on meetings and how many participants they will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>have. This is not a good set of indicators for change. This last point repeats itself in many of the sub-components. Please address.</p> <p>output 2.3 in RF. This set of activities is supposed to lead to a change in fishing behavior and management practices. However, reading the targets and sources of verification, one is lead to believe that the subcomponent is primarily a scientific exercise leading to reports. Please include indicators that lend themselves to verify the environmental and socio economic impact of the activities. The same is the case for Output 2.4 in the RF. However in Component 2.4 in RF there is one useful target that actually identifies impact on the ground (ecosystem approach to fisheries adopted in 10 fishing communities for red grouped and brown shrimp). the next step would then be to identify a set of outputs/targets that would identify the impact on the ground of the adoption of the Ecosystem approach to fisheries being adopted.</p> <p>on component 3 in RF. Please note that solid waste is not fundable under the IW focal area and such activities needs to be funded by other sources of cofinancing.</p> <p>IS the main output of component 3.1 reports on community engagement and number of people trained? The component is not describing the impact on the environment of these activities.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Please include.</p> <p>Component 3.2 in RF, again, focused on the amount of people to be trained. The objective is a very concrete one, namely restoring a number of wetlands, most likely to increase infiltration capacity for wastewater treatment and for their Biodiversity value. However, again the targets and sources of verification talks about number of people trained and reports being written. The subcomponent totally omits the environmental impact and including these as outputs. Please include.</p> <p>Subcomponent 3.4 is to increase effectiveness of MPAs, which is indeed important, but again, the targets is primarily focused on how many people will be part of the work and omits to include environmental benefits of the interventions. Please change.</p> <p>Reading through the activity descriptions, it seems out of place, to include the format of a report that is yet to be written (under 2.2.2), instead of focusing on the content of such a management plan.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: No, please remove the 4 hotspots from output 1.3 in table B in coherence to your response</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			13th of October 2016: Addressed
	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.	1st of April 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the incremental reasoning is sound and appropriate, while the GEBs have also been identified.
	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?		8th of April 2016 (cseverin):Yes, the project includes detailed descriptions of the socio economic as well as gender benefits that the project will have.
	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. 29th of September 2016: Addressed
	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)	15th of August 2014: Addressed, however please at time of CEO Endorsement elaborate on not only climate change as the major driver for fisheries degradation in the region, but also unsustainable (over)fishing practices.	8th of April 2016 (cseverin): Yes and hence a matrix have been included that identified a number of risks and their associated Mitigation measures.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	15th of March 2014: Yes	8th of April 2016 (cseverin):YEs

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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. 	<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>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin): Addressing the commonly agreed priorities through a regional endorsed Strategic Action Program is considered innovative to a LME that to date may have been lacking a coherent approach towards the transboundary issues.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):Yes</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin): Yes</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>15th of August 2014: Yes the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B is considered to be appropriate and adequate to achieve the identified outcomes and outputs.</p>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin): there is discrepancies between the amount of cofinancing mentioned in table A and C compared to the amounts listed on page 77. Please explain/correct.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: Addressed</p>
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate?</p>	<p>15th of August 2014: The composition is ok, but there is a lack of Private sector financing towards the project. Please</p>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):Yes, but please double check and make sure there is coherency between numbers of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>	<p>explore, during the PPG phase and make sure to include private sector players early in the project development.</p>	<p>cofinancing mentioned in the text of the project document and what is presented in the tables. Further, the amount of cofinancing listed in table C does not correspond with the amounts in the cofinancing letters, this is with special reference to the SEMERNAT letter.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: Addressed</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>15th of August 2014: YES PM budget is fully inline with the GEF guidance.</p>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):Yes it is in coherency with GEF guidance.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>15th of August 2014: Yes PPG has been requested and the amount is fully inline with the GEF guidance.</p>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):fund status of the PPG funds included, but description missing. Please provide.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: Addressed</p>
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>15th of August 2014: NA</p>	<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):NA</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):Yes TT have been submitted, but please ensure that there is cohenrecy between what is reported on the GEBs in table E and what is noted in the IW TT.</p> <p>Further, It is suprising that NEXUS comes out so strong in the IW TT, as this project primarily is dealing with the Gulf of MEXico, where as the Nexus investments primarily will pertain to more direct investments in</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>transboundary freshwater investments. If this is national Basins, please note this and do not include in the IW TT, as that is only to capture transboundary Nexus investments.</p> <p>Please also ensure that the IW TT is updated with the TEST deliverables, as soon as baseline has been obtained.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: Addressed</p>
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):No, please include matrix that illustrated the budget to the described activities.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: Addressed</p>
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin): Yes the STAP comments have been adequately addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		<p>8th of April 2016 (cseverin):No, there is no record that the Council comments have been addressed. Please include.</p> <p>29th of September 2016: Addressed</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</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>	

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

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		13th of October 2016 Addressed	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		8th of April 2016 (cseverin):No, Please address the comments above 15th of October 2016: Yes, CEO Endorsement is being recommended.
	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.**