



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

GEF ID:	5785		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Sustainable Land Management Promotion		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$1,735,160
Co-financing:	\$8,746,566	Total Project Cost:	\$10,664,374
PIF Approval:	June 16, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Benjamin Kiersch

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 ?	March 26, 2014 Yes, Mexico is eligible. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes, Mexico is still eligible. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 26, 2014 Yes, the OFP endorsement is included with the submission. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.
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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the Government is requesting \$2 million (including Agency fees and PPG) from its allocation, which is available.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The full amount requested is available under the LD allocation.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/a	N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/a	N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/a	N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/a	N/a
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the project is fully aligned with the LD focal area results framework, and will contribute specifically to LD1 and LD3.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes, the project is still fully aligned with LD1 and LD3.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

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)
	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?	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes, consistency with national strategies including the UNCCD NAP is adequately described.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
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>March 26, 2014</p> <p>The baseline context and projects are sufficiently described from a national perspective. However, the description of "remaining barriers" needs to be made clearer relative to land degradation challenge. Furthermore, the transition to "six micro-regions" is not clear, especially as they relate to the overall challenge of land degradation as described. Please clarify how the micro-regions fit into the baseline. It will be helpful to add information on the social mobilization processes that will define scaling up from parcels to territories and how stakeholders at those levels will engage. Will there be community/stakeholder appraisals. social mobilization, etc that will map out youth and women integration processes?</p> <p>May 9, 2014</p> <p>The additional details are adequate, thanks.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes, the baseline description is based on sound data and assumptions. The national and sub-national context provides a strong foundation for the project.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>The project framework is sound and very clear, thanks. But please address the following in Table B -</p> <p>a) add the Project Objective and Grant Types</p> <p>b) Output 1.1.2 - it is not clear how the establishment of one youngster school will lead to adoption of SLM; please provide additional information in the narrative on this aspect beyond just "generational gap in SLM"</p> <p>c) Output 2.1.1 - processes are not outputs per se....what will they deliver?</p> <p>May 9, 2014</p> <p>The comment has been fully addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>The project framework was streamlined and improved during project development, which makes the outcomes and outputs much clearer.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>The description of GEBs is not consistent with priority of the LD focal area. Rather than presenting GEBs separately for each objective (section A.1, 5), please consolidate into a minimum set that is achievable based on incremental reasoning for the overall project. Please separate the local development benefits (e.g. income, crop yields, etc.) from the GEBs even if they are linked in principle. Note that results-based M&E system, land planning and governance, etc. are not GEBs.</p> <p>May 9, 2014</p>	<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>The GEBs are identified, but there is an apparent disconnect between how they are described in the project document and presented in the LD Tracking Tool. In order to demonstrate consistency, please clarify how the following will be measured and quantified as indicated in the TT and relative to the 86,818 has targeted for territorial planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land Cover - 3800 has - Tree density - 400/ha - Improved irrigation flow - 30 has - Water availability - 3800 has <p>What tools and best practices will be</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		GEBs are now appropriately defined. Cleared	employed to establish baseline and monitor progress toward outcomes during project implementation?
	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?		September 21, 2015 Yes, the socio-economic benefits and approach to delivery are adequately described. Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	March 26, 2014 Yes. The PIF gives due consideration to public participation, including youth and woment groups. It is noted that dditional details on roles and process for engagement will be addressed during project development. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes, the project document provides adequate details on engagement of relevant stakeholders and target beneficiaries, and taking into account gender dimensions. Cleared
	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)	March 26, 2014 Yes. Risks have been identified and described reasonably. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes, risks have been further elaborated and responses clarified. Cleared
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	March 26, 2014 Yes. Consistency and coordination with other relevant initiatives are adequately reflected in the PIF. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes. Consistency and coordination with other relevant initiatives have been further detailed in the project document. Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects ,	March 26, 2014	September 21, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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>The PIF includes elements of innovativeness and sustainability with respect to advancing SLM across multiple scales - parcels, watersheds, micro-regions, and territories. The institutional framework and approach to mobilizing stakeholders (including women and youth) will help establish a strong foundation for scaling-up SLM. However, more information is needed on how best practices will be adapted to specific biophysical and socio-economic circumstances of the targeted micro-regions and / or watersheds. How will ownership of the interventions be assured, including oversight for assets to be created with GEF support?</p> <p>May 9, 2014</p> <p>The potential for sustainability and scaling-up has been clarified, and ownership will be assured during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>The project innovativeness is based on the framework for "PROTIERRAS" or promotion of SLM, which is envisaged as a model to be applied more widely in regions of the country affected by LD. The basis for sustainability and scaling-up is well established by embedding interventions at grassroots level within micro-regions, and linking with territorial planning.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes and the streamlined results framework is fully explained and justified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative		<p>September 21, 2015</p> <p>For an MSP in a country that is affected by LD, the proposed approach is a cost-effective way of influencing policies and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	approaches to achieve similar benefits?		practices for SLM. A likely alternative is to invest nationally, which will be most certainly expensive, top down and unsustainable in the long run. Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 26, 2014 Yes, the breakdown of both the GEF grant and co-financing is appropriate and adequate. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes, the breakdown is still appropriate and adequate. Cleared
	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?	March 26, 2014 Yes, the total co-financing of \$6.5 million is all in cash from National Government agencies. However, there is no indicative amount from the GEF Agency despite articulation of its important role for the project. Please address. May 9, 2014 This has been addressed. Cleared	September 21, 2015 The total co-financing is now \$8.7 million and still mostly in cash from participating government agencies. The amount contributed by FAO is in line with its role as GEF Agency for the project. Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	March 26, 2014 The PMC slightly exceeds 10% and should be adjusted. May 9, 2014 Addressed Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	March 26, 2014 Yes, PPG is requested but needs to be adequately justified relative to project needs. May 9, 2014 PPG request is now adequately justified. Cleared	September 21, 2015 Yes, PPG was utilized and activities highlighted in the project document. Cleared
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	N/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		September 21, 2015 Yes Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		September 21, 2015 Yes Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	March 26, 2014 No. PIF clearance cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address concerns expressed in this	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		review. May 9, 2014 Yes, PIF clearance is now recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		September 21, 2015 No, the MSP cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address comments in #8. October 28, 2015 All comments have been addressed. The MSP is now recommended for CEO approval.
	First review*	March 26, 2014	September 21, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 09, 2014	
	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.