



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Sustainable Land Management Promotion			
Country(ies):	Mexico	GEF Project ID:	5785
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	629019
Other Executing Partner(s):	Secretariat of Environment And Natural Resources (SEMARNAT); through the Center for Education and Training For Sustainable Development (CECADESU) and the General Directorate of Primary Sector and Natural Renewable Resources (DGSPNR).	Submission Date:	07/10/2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>		Agency Fee (\$):	164,840

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
LD-1	Outcome 1.2: Improved agricultural management	Output 1.2 : Types of innovative SL/WM practices introduced at field level	GEFTF	418,609	120,000
LD-3	Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities Outcome 3.3: Increased investments in integrated landscape management	Output 3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented Output 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested Output 3.3 Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base Output 3.4 Information on INRM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated	GEFTF	1,158,810	8,199,356
Sub-Total				1,577,419	8,319,356
Project management cost				157,741	427,210
Total project costs				1,735,160	8,746,566

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Reduce land degradation through the implementation of a land management model focused on Sustainable Land Management and the strengthening of local institutions to facilitate the concurrence of multi-sectoral policies and investment in public goods in 3 priority micro regions.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Governance for institutional strengthening and SLM-focused land management	TA	<p>Outcome 1.1: Local actors committed to and trained in SLM practices</p> <p><i>Target: 1 Municipality, 3 Agrarian Units and 15 Civil Society and Producer Organizations in each micro-region (MR) jointly take part in decision making for land management</i></p> <p>Outcome 1.2: SLM approach mainstreamed into local territorial management</p> <p><i>Target: 86,818 ha under territorial planning with an SLM approach</i></p> <p>Outcome 1.3: Investment for SLM increased in the MRs</p> <p><i>Indicator LD-3 iii: Increased investment in integrated landscape management</i></p> <p><i>Baseline: USD 703,406 invested in 2012-2014</i></p> <p><i>Target: USD 8,524,995 invested by PY4</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1.1: Three (3) Territorial Management Committees established</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Local stakeholders trained in territorial management and SLM (local institutions, extension workers, local producer organizations) (300)</p> <p>Output 1.2.1: Land Management Plans formulated with the participation of local stakeholders (3).</p> <p>Output 1.2.2: Territorial regulations formulated by land users to foster SLM (3)</p> <p>Output 1.3.3: Integrated financing strategies for SLM developed in a participatory manner including public and private financing sources</p>	GEFTF	229,338	523,074
2. Integrated landscape management practices in priority	INV	<p>Outcome 2.1: SLM implemented in degraded watersheds</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: Demonstration units with SLM practices established (500 ha), involving youngsters and</p>	GEFTF	1,152,187	7,543,911

watersheds and productive areas, including SLM practices		<p><u>Indicator LD3-ii a:</u> <i>Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes</i></p> <p><u>Target:</u> 3,800 has covered through project-supported activities</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: Technical capacities for SLM strengthened, contributing to improve the communities' livelihoods</p> <p><u>Indicator LD1-ii:</u> <i>Rate of vulnerability of livelihoods, as perceived by the communities</i></p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> high perceived vulnerability (rate 2)</p> <p><u>Target:</u> Medium perceived vulnerability (rate 3)</p> <p>Increased agricultural productivity by +20% (Baseline: 1.44 tn/ha)</p>	<p>women</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Project profiles formulated and implemented on Replication Units over 3,300 has</p> <p>Output 2.2.1: Capacity-building plans for SLM, with special emphasis on the involvement and reintegration of youth and women with their land</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: Establishment of an experience exchange mechanism with an emphasis on the youth and women in the 3 micro regions</p>			
3. PROTIERRAS intervention models systematized, evaluated and disseminated		<p>Outcome 3.1: Systematized information on project results and other relevant experiences disseminated at the micro regional, regional, state, and national levels.</p> <p><u>Target:</u> The PROTIERRAS model is systematized and</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1: PROTIERRAS communication strategy designed and implemented, with a special emphasis on youth and women.</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: Mechanism for knowledge exchange with international initiatives such as LADA-WOCAT</p>	GEFTF	195,894	252,371

		<i>consolidated</i>	Output 3.1.3: PROTERRAS intervention model systematized and published, including lessons learned			
		Outcome 3.2: Project implemented on a results based management approach <i>Target: Project results achieved, demonstrating sustainability</i>	Output 3.2.1: Establishment of a monitoring and evaluation system Output 3.2.2: Mid-term review and final evaluation			
Subtotal					1,577,419	8,319,356
Project management Cost (PMC)				GEFTF	157,741	427,210
Total project costs					1,735,160	8,746,566

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
Federal government	DGSPNR - SEMARNAT	Grant	600,000
		In-kind	68,074
National Government	CECADESU - SEMARNAT	Grant	
		In-kind	250,000
Federal government	SAGARPA	Grant	6,000,000
Federal government	CONAFOR	Grant	1,728,492
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	100,000
Total Co-financing			8,746,566

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	Land Degradation	Mexico	1,735,160	164,840	1,900,000
Total Grant Resources				1,735,160	164,840	1,900,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants			
National/Local Consultants	647,295		647,295

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF****A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

No changes from PIF. Please refer to the Section 1.5 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

This proposal is consistent with Objective LD-1: *Agriculture and Rangeland Systems: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services sustaining the livelihoods of local communities*, in particular with Outcome 1.2: *Improved agricultural management*. Under Component 2, the project will strengthen the technical capacity of farmers and other local stakeholders in SLM, contributing to increasing agricultural productivity and reducing the vulnerability of the local rural population.

In addition, the project is consistent with Objective LD-3: *Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape*; and in particular with Outcome 3.1: *Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management*. Component 1 will contribute to this by creating an enabling environment for integrated landscape management through: i) strengthening governance for integrated land management focused on sustainable land management; ii) improved inter-sectoral coordination; iii) training of key actors in the territory; iv) design of land management plans and regulations for implementation; v) increase in the domestic investment for integrated landscape management in three targeted micro regions.

The project will also contribute to achieve Outcome 3.2 *Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities*, by supporting the establishment of integrated natural resources management practices in 3,800 has under Component 2, and Outcome 3.3 *Increased investments in integrated landscape management*, by facilitating the access of small-scale farmers to public funds that support SLM and sustainable forest management (kindly see SAGARPA and CONAFOR programs under sub-section 1.2.2 of the FAO GEF Project Document for a detailed description). In addition the project will support the increase of investments of the small-scale farmers in 500 hectares through the dissemination and implementation of SLM practices in their agricultural plots. For further description, please see Section 1.3 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

No changes from PIF.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The baseline project and barriers that the project seeks to address have been further analyzed and detailed during the full project preparation. Please see the FAO-GEF Project Document sections 1.2.1 *Threats to Global Environmental Benefits*, 1.2.2 *Baseline initiatives*; and 1.2.3 *Remaining barriers*.

A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The project aims to reduce land degradation through the implementation of a land management model focused on SLM and the strengthening of local institutions to facilitate the concurrence of multi-sectoral policies and investment in public goods in 3 priority micro regions.

GEF incremental financing of USD 229,338 for Component 1 will be invested in: i) technical assistance for the creation and operation of Territorial Management Committees; ii) land management and SLM capacity building for key local actors; iii) technical assistance for the participatory formulation of land management plans and necessary rules for implementation; iv) technical assistance and capacity building for the formulation and application of integrated financing strategies for the SLM. Co-financing for Component 1 comprises the methodological framework for land use planning and management and for training in SLM, support to the Territorial Management Committees, support and coordination for the creation of Integrated Financing Strategies. SAGARPA will contribute USD 360,000 in cash. SEMARNAT will contribute USD 68,074 in kind through DGSPRNR and USD 20,000 in kind through CECADESU. FAO will contribute USD 75,000 in-kind.

GEF incremental financing of USD 1,152,187 in Component 2 will support the establishment of Demonstration Sites/Units, the provision of technical assistance and the support to producers in the implementation of SLM practices, support to project formulation for public funding and replication activities, establishment and implementation of experiences exchange mechanisms between the different micro regions, and capacity building.

Co-financing for Component 2 will be directed to funding the replication of the demonstration sites/units in selected plots, covering an area of 3,300 hectares. In particular, co-financing resources will provide support for the preparation of studies, the design and implementation of conservation agriculture projects, and the sustainable use of soil and water, support for conservation and soil restoration works, reforestation and fencing, restoration of priority watersheds, establishment of land management practices, seed purchases, plants and supplies, training, technical assistance, and community empowerment. In the framework of the programs described in Sub-section 1.2.2 of the FAO GEF Project Document, SAGARPA will contribute USD 5,358,000 in cash; CONAFOR will contribute USD 1,614,411 in cash; and SEMARNAT will contribute USD 571,500 in cash through DGSPRNR.

GEF incremental financing of USD 195,894 in Component 3 will be used to provide technical assistance for data collection, knowledge management, publication and communication materials, project M&E and the dissemination of lessons learned through the Mexican government and the FAO network related to LADA/WOCAT methodologies.

The co-financing for Component 3 will be used to gather information for the evaluation of the results achieved by the project in the selected replication plots and to provide strategic guidelines, methodological tools and support for the systematization of the PROTIERRAS intervention model and the dissemination of information including a communications strategy. CECADESU will contribute USD 200,000 in kind. SAGARPA will contribute USD 42,000 in cash. CONAFOR will contribute USD 10,371 in cash.

Expected global environmental and adaptation benefits

National and local authorities, communities, small farmers, youth and women that participate in the project will help deliver the following global environmental benefits:

- i. Reduction of land degradation processes in the areas of project intervention. In particular, processes associated with soil fertility loss, wind erosion and water erosion;
- ii. Increased area under territorial planning with SLM approach: baseline: 0; target: 86,818 has (Outcome 1.2, Annex A of this CEO ER);
- iii. Increased investment in integrated landscape management: from USD 703,406 to USD 8,524,995 (Outcome 1.3, Annex A), as per indicator LD-3 iii);
- iv. Increased spatial coverage of INRM practices in the wider landscape in 3800 hectares (Outcome 2.1, Annex A), as per indicator LD-3 ii a)

- v. Improved agricultural management, in the project intervention areas (3800 hectares): from rate 1 (productivity decreased) to rate 2 (productivity stable), as per the GEF LD tracking tool, indicator LD-1 ii);
- vi. Improvement in the provision of ecosystem goods and services. The introduction of SLM practices and improved management of integrated natural resources in an area of 3,800 hectares will increase productivity and sustain the livelihoods of local communities;
- vii. In terms of global public goods, PROTIERRAS model will be systematized and shared through FAO with other member countries using the LADA-WOCAT methodologies to reduce land degradation worldwide.

In addition, project stakeholders will help deliver and benefit from project *adaptation benefits* as follows:

- viii. Reduction in the vulnerability of agricultural ecosystems to climate change and other human-induced impacts: the adoption of SLM measures will reduce the vulnerability of the 580 beneficiary farmers to climate variability and change, by increasing the stability of production in terms of quantity and quality. Baseline: perceived high vulnerability (rate 2). Target: perceived medium vulnerability (rate 3), as per indicator LD-1 ii). (Outcome 2.2, Annex A)
- ix. Increased agricultural productivity: +20% in the project intervention areas (Outcome 2.2, Annex A).

Changes in the results framework compared to the PIF

The objective of the project remains unchanged. The Project Results Framework has been streamlined to facilitate project implementation and M&E. The full project framework is described in detail in the FAO-GEF Project Document (Section 1.3) and Annex A of this CEO Endorsement request. The adjustments introduced into the project results framework and the rationale are described below:

PIF	CEO Endorsement
Component 1: Implementation of best practices of Sustainable Land Management in strategic agro-productive landscapes.	For coherence reasons, all field activities have been concentrated under Component 2: Integrated landscape management practices in priority watersheds and productive areas, including SLM practices. The budget has been allocated accordingly.
Outcome 1.1: Community-based Sustainable Land Management practices adopted by 30 communities.	The project design has been streamlined. The project will support, implement, disseminate and facilitate the financing of SLM practices in 3800 hectares, as foreseen in the PIF. The 3800 hectares will serve as indicator of project Outcome 2.1: SLM implemented in degraded watersheds . Former Outcome 1.1, is now Outcome 2.1 and Outcome 2.2: Technical capacities for SLM strengthened, contributing to improve the communities' livelihoods .
Output 1.1.1: 18 Demonstrative Reference Sites for SLM (DRS) established. Output 1.1.2: 30 direct beneficiaries per DRS – total of 540 - trained in SLM practices (men, women and youngsters).	Output 2.1.1: Demonstration units with SLM practices established (500 ha), involving youngsters and women. The project will apply the farmer field school approach, selecting demonstration units that will then serve to replicate and up-scale the SLM model in the territory with public

	funding.
Output 1.1.3: One (1) DRS network designed and implemented, covering 3,780 hectares under SLM.	<p>Output 2.1.2: Project profiles formulated and implemented on Replication Units over 3,300 has</p> <p>To ensure sustainability after project termination, the project will support the access of small-scale farmers to public incentives that are now out of their reach due to lack of capacities. There will be an increase of SLM investment by PY3.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: Establishment of an experience exchange mechanism with an emphasis on the youth and women in the 3 micro regions.</p>
Output 1.1.2: One youngsters school established in each micro-region, total of 6.	<p>Output 2.2.1: Capacity-building plans for SLM, with special emphasis on the involvement and reintegration of youth and women with their land.</p> <p>Given the limit amount of funds, the project will support the design of CB plans that will be implemented in coordination with CECADESU. After project termination, CECADESU will continue the implementation of these plans in similar micro-regions.</p>
Output 1.1.5: 30 best practices implemented in 54 communities, 15 evaluated using LADA-WOCAT approach. One catalogue of best practices developed through the DRS network.	<p>The knowledge management output has been moved under Component 3.</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: Mechanism for knowledge exchange with international initiatives such as LADA-WOCAT</p> <p>Output 3.1.3: PROTIERRAS intervention model systematized and published, including lessons learned</p> <p>The M&E output has been included under the project M&E:</p> <p>Output 3.2.1: Establishment of a monitoring and evaluation system</p>
Outcome 2.1: SLM included as part of the land planning processes.	<p>Institutional strengthening has been concentrated under Component 1: Governance for institutional strengthening and SLM-focused land management.</p> <p>The micro-regions have been reduced to 3. The number of hectares remains unchanged.</p> <p>In order to reinforce incrementality and project sustainability, output 1.3.3 has been included:</p> <p>Output 1.3.3: Integrated financing strategies for SLM developed in a participatory manner including public and private financing sources</p>
Output: 2.1.1 Capacities of local government agencies and civil society organizations strengthened	Output 1.1.2: Local stakeholders trained in territorial management and SLM (local institutions, extension workers,

in 6 regions on land planning, SLM practices, and integrated landscape management	local producer organizations) (300)
Output 2.1.2: 6 Land Planning Committees of SLM established, with their specific objectives and guidelines.	Output 1.1.1: Three (3) Territorial Management Committees established
Output 2.1.3: 6 Land Use Plans at micro-watersheds/agro-productive areas level elaborated	Output 1.2.1: Land Management Plans formulated with the participation of local stakeholders (3), Output 1.2.2: Territorial regulations formulated by land users to foster SLM (3)
Output 2.1.4: 18 Municipal Education Plans on SLM, designed and implemented, with specific strategies to promote women's participation.	Output 3.1.1: PROTIERRAS communication strategy designed and implemented, with a special emphasis on youth and women.

Please refer to Sections 1.3.2 *Project objectives, outcomes and outputs* of the FAO-GEF Project Document for a detailed description. Please refer to Section 1.3.4 *Expected global environmental benefits* of the Project Document for a full description of GEBs. The Project Results Framework in Annex A includes GEB and adaptation benefit indicators and targets at outcome level.

As a consequence of the regrouping of some Outputs and more detailed development of the project interventions there have also been changes in the resources distribution between the PIF and CEO endorsement stages. Please refer to the Results Budget in Appendix 3 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The risks identified in the PIF remain. The mitigation measures have been further assessed and described. Please refer to Appendix 4 "Risk Matrix" of the FAO GEF Project Document for the full risk assessment.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

FAO and the project partners will collaborate with the implementing agencies of other programs and projects in order to identify opportunities and mechanisms to facilitate synergies with other relevant GEF projects, as well as projects supported by other donors. This collaboration will include: (i) informal communications between GEF agencies and other partners in implementing programs and projects; and (ii) exchange of information and outreach materials between projects.

In particular, the project will develop mechanisms for collaboration with the following initiatives:

1. GEF Project #4792, *Conservation of Coastal Watersheds to Achieve Multiple Global Environmental Benefits in the Context of Changing Environments*, implemented by the World Bank. This is a comprehensive proposal implemented by the National Commission of Protected Natural Areas (CONANP) addressing coastal watersheds in the protected areas of Baja California and Veracruz with a cross-sectoral approach, including LD focal area objectives. PROTIERRAS will develop mechanisms of cooperation within Components 2 and 3, in order to exchange CONANP experiences and lessons learned that are related to LD.

2. GEF Project #4922, *Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling up of Sustainable Land Management*, a global initiative led by FAO and implemented in 15 countries worldwide, including 4 in Latin America: Argentina, Colombia,

Ecuador and Panama. The project aims to document, analyze and disseminate SLM experiences using participatory decision-making tools based on FAO LADA-WOCAT methodology. This methodology is a strategic PROTIERRAS tool. During project implementation (PROTIERRAS), exchanges of experiences with the countries involved in this LADA global project will be promoted.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

B.1.1 Project implementation and management arrangements

The Project Management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E through its decision-making structures: Liaison Committee and Project Steering Committee.

The **Liaison Committee** will be comprised by high level officers from the SEMARNAT, through DGSPNR and CECADESU, CONAFOR, SAGARPA, and FAO Representation in Mexico. Its main function is to position the PROTIERRAS project under the SINADES framework and other institutions related with the Project's objectives, in order to promote the experience to be replicated nationwide. It is responsible for convening and monitoring agreements with other national or international bodies that can contribute to PROTIERRAS objectives.

The **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** will have the role of overseeing and coordinating the project's planning and implementation. The PSC consists of the staff (at directorate /coordination level) of the institutions that participate in the Liaison Committee (SAGARPA, CONAFOR, SEMARNAT through DGSPNR and CECADESU, and FAO Mexico). The PSC is a collegial advisory body and its main functions are: i) monitor and support the PCU for the successful implementation of the project's three components; ii) coordinate and manage, through institutional means, the contribution in kind and/or in cash agreed by each participating institution of the project, as well as other funding sources in keeping with project objectives; iii) review and agree on the project's strategy and methodology as submitted by the PCU, as well as changes and modifications as a result of its application in the field; iv) endorse annual work plan and budget; v) convene and organize meetings with the various national, state and micro regional participants in the project; and vi) promote agreements and other forms of collaborations with national and international organizations.

B.1.2 Stakeholder involvement plan

The stakeholder mapping carried out during project preparation is presented in the table below, including their roles and participation in project implementation.

Stakeholder	Interest/role in the project
FAO	GEF implementing agency.
Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)	Is the federal agency responsible for promoting the protection, restoration and conservation of Mexico's ecosystems, natural resources and environmental goods and services, in order to promote their sustainable use and development. Co-executing partner. Technical-political coordination to ensure synergy between baseline programs and project activities.
The Center for Education and Training for Sustainable Development (CECADESU)	It is part of SEMARNAT and develops and implements strategies, programs, projects and actions to promote an environmental culture. Co-executing partner. Technical-political coordination to ensure synergy between baseline programs and project activities
National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR)	Is responsible for the federal government's programs and policies for conservation, sustainable use and management of the country's forest resources. Project co-financier.
The Secretariat of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food (SAGARPA)	Among its objectives, the promotion of political support to improve production, better exploit comparative advantages in the agricultural sector, integrate rural production chains with the rest of the economy, and set the goals and objectives for the agricultural sector in the National Development Plan. Project co-financier.

Local Technical Agencies (LTAs).	NGOs with experience in promoting SLM in project intervention area. Partner for implementation at local level. Local resources mobilization, monitoring and evaluation at local level.
Promoters	Producers, male and female, who have demonstrated interest and ability to develop SLM systems. They will be members of local organizations to facilitate replication.
Producers in selected replication plots	Organized or individual producers, male and female, that are interested in replicating SLM models on their plots. They will receive project support to access financing sources and training from promoters. Direct beneficiaries of project intervention.
Youth, male and female	Youth (up to 39 years old), male and female, that do not own land but have access to parental lands and are interested in staying in their communities. Direct beneficiaries of project intervention.
Farmers' organizations	Local farmers' organizations (legally constituted or not) and people involved in the processing and marketing of farm products. Beneficiaries of project intervention.
Agrarian authorities	Authorities and committees that are part of the governing bodies of the micro regions' agrarian units. They will be directly involved in regional planning exercises and in the formulation of MR coordination councils.
Municipal authorities	Authorities and committees that are part of the MRs' local governments. They will be directly involved in the management processes and the formulation of MR coordination councils.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The implementation of SLM practices will promote food security in project intervention areas. Increased agricultural productivity in plots using SLM will help improve food availability for personal consumption as well as for local markets. Production resilience against climate variability and extreme events will also increase, resulting in greater stability of food availability.

The project is focused on promoting the participation of women and young people and empowering them to strengthen their role in planning and decision-making, and to improve their productivity, income, and living conditions. Participation will take place in the Territorial Management Committees, with the request that each agrarian center, municipality, and producer organization select male and female representatives to compose the TMC. The project will also facilitate women's access to training and technical assistance, and incentives for sustainable production (Component 2), input production, or processing in backyards or other spaces that are normally under the individual or collective control of women. In addition, women will be selected as promoters to participate in activities related to SLM development, activities related to backyard production or transformation, and the introduction of technologies to lighten the workload of women. Data will be disaggregated by gender to monitor for the differential impacts of the project and female producers will be involved and represented in all project activities. Women will make up at least 30% of the beneficiaries of the project. Young people will be at least 10% of the beneficiaries.

Cultural diversity has been identified as a major factor in the country and in the areas of intervention. In Valle del Mezquital and La Mixteca most households identify themselves as indigenous and maintain a strong ancestral culture.

This is reflected in a system of social organization that is based on the community and the civic participation of all members, decision-making in the form of assemblies and by consensus, and the widespread use of *milpa* (cornfield) plots, which is land dedicated to the production of grain and vegetables for personal consumption. Although there are individual plots in indigenous agrarian centers, a higher proportion of the land area is often managed communally. In this regard, the ethno-cultural characteristics of the indigenous peoples living in the prioritized communities will be taken into account in all areas, promoting dialogue and exchange between technical expertise and traditional and ancestral knowledge, in order to promote the complete and effective participation of different communities in the validation, development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project to respect expressions, values, and cultural traditions. During project preparation, meetings have been held with the local authorities, representatives of farmer organizations, and NGOs working in the micro regions in order to meet the needs of indigenous people and their desire for the possible intervention of the project in their communities.

The project, through a capacity-development strategy, seeks to improve the conditions for self-employment and, in particular, broaden the outlook of economic integration for rural youth.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Kindly refer to sections 4.5. *Appropriateness of Technologies Introduced and Cost/Effectiveness* and 4.6 *Innovativeness, Replication and Scale-Up* of the FAO GEF Project Document for a full description. Appendix 8 of the FAO GEF Project Document provides a detailed list of best practices to be implemented in each micro-region.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving the results and objectives of the Project will be based on targets and indicators of the Project Results Framework (Annex A of this CEO request and Sub-section 1.3.2 of the FAO GEF Project Document). Project M&E activities are budgeted at USD 83,099 (see Table below) and will follow FAO and GEF policies and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation. The M&E system will also facilitate learning and replication of the project's results and lessons in relation to the integrated management of natural resources. The M&E Expert (see TORs in Appendix 6 of the FAO GEF Project Document) will prepare a draft M&E matrix that will be discussed and agreed upon by all stakeholders during the inception workshop. The M&E Plan will be prepared by the M&E Expert in the three first months of the Project Year (PY1) and validated with the PSC. A full description of the M&E matrix and plan is detailed in Sub-section 3.5.1 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

Summary of main monitoring and evaluation activities

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
Inception workshop	NPC; FAOMX (with support from the LTO, and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 3,000
Project Inception report	NPC, Expert M&E and FAOMX with clearance by the LTO, BH and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	-
Field-based impact monitoring	NPC; project partners, local organizations	Continuous	USD 10,000 (9% of the Project Coordinator's time, technical workshops to identify indicators, monitoring and evaluation workshops)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in	PC; FAO (FAOMX, LTO). FAO-GEF Coordination Unit may participate in	Annual, or as needed	FAO visits will be borne by GEF

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
PPRs and PIRs	the visits if needed.		agency fees Project Coordination visits shall be borne by the project's travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPRs)	PC, with stakeholder contributions and other participating institutions	Six-monthly	USD 2,760 (3.5% of the Project Coordinator's time)
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	Drafted by the NPC, with the supervision of the LTO and BH. Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	FAO staff time financed through GEF agency fees. PCU time covered by the project budget.
Co-financing reports	PC with input from other co-financiers	Annual	USD 789 (1% of the Coordinator's time)
Technical reports	PC, FAO (LTO, FAOMX)	As needed	
Mid-term review	FAOMX, External consultant, in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	Midway through the project implementation period	USD 15,000 by an external consultancy
Final evaluation	External consultant, FAO Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	At the end of the project	USD 45,000 by an external consultancy. FAO staff time and travel costs will be financed by GEF agency fees.
Terminal Report	PC; FAO (FAOMX, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, TCS Reporting Unit)	Two months prior to the end of the project.	USD 6550
Total budget			USD 83,099


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**
(Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Jorge Mulhia Almazan	Political and Operational Focal Point to the GEF	SECRETARIA DE HACIENDA Y CRÉDITO PÚBLICO	MARCH, 4, 2014

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		07 October 2015	Benjamin Kiersch Valeria Gonzalez Riggio	+56 229232129	Benjamin.kiersch@fao.org Valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division. FAO				+3906 57055680	GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions
Objective: Reduce land degradation through the implementation of a land management model focused on Sustainable Land Management and the strengthening of local institutions to facilitate the concurrence of multi-sectoral policies and investment in public goods in 3 priority micro regions.						
Component 1: Governance for institutional strengthening and SLM-focused land management						
Outcome 1.1 Local actors committed to and trained in SLM practices	No. of participants that jointly take part in decision making for land management	0	1 Municipality, 3 Agrarian Units and 15 Civil Society and Producer Organizations in each micro-region (MR)	1 Municipality, 3 Agrarian Centers, 15 Civil Society and Producer Organizations in each MR	Minutes of the meetings of Territorial Management Committees Reports from the Local Technical Agencies	Willingness of the municipal groups and agrarian centers to create a regional coordination entity
Output 1.1.1: Three (3) Territorial Management Committees established	Territorial management committees established	No such committees exist in the micro regions	3	3	TMC charter Minutes of TMC meetings	
Output 1.1.2: Local stakeholders trained in territorial management and SLM (local institutions, extension workers, local producer organizations) (300)	Participants trained in SLM Information and training sessions	0	300	300	Minutes of TMC meetings	
Outcome 1.2 SLM approach mainstreamed into local territorial management	Area under territorial planning with an SLM approach	0	86,818 has	86,818 has	Published documentation of the Land Management Plans	Willingness of the involved institutional actors to incorporate the SLM approach in planning and

								regulatory instruments
Output 1.2.1: Land Management Plans formulated with the participation of local stakeholders (3)	Approved integrated land management plans (LD3-i)	0	3	3			3	Published documentation of the Land Management Plans Minutes of TMC meetings
Output 1.2.2: Territorial regulations formulated by land users to foster SLM (3)	Approved land regulations to foster SLM	0	3	3			3	Published regulatory documents Minutes of TMC meetings
<u>Outcome 1.3</u> Investment for SLM increased in the MRs	Increased investment in integrated landscape management (LD3 iii)	USD 703,406 (investment in 2012-2014 in the MRs)	USD 3,600,000	USD 8,524,995				The institutional programs of SEMARNAT, CONAFOR, SAGARPA and other institutions maintain their rules of operation and availability of funds Approval documents for financing by SEMARNAT, CONAFOR, SAGARPA, and other institutions LTA reports
Output 1.3.3: Integrated financing strategies for SLM developed in a participatory manner including public and private financing sources	Formulated strategies for integrated SLM financing	0	3	3			3	
Component 2: Integrated landscape management practices in priority watersheds and productive areas, including SLM practices								
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>	Spatial coverage of INRM practices	796 has	2,150 hectares covered through	3,800 hectares covered				LTA registries Climate change effects are kept

SLM implemented in degraded watersheds	in the wider landscape (LD3-ii a)		project-supported activities	through project-supported activities	TMC self-review system	within forecast range and natural conditions for production are maintained
Output 2.1.1: Demonstration units with SLM practices established (500 ha), involving youngsters and women	Established demonstration units Technical assistance sessions	0 0	3 42	3 108	LTA reports Record of technical assistance sessions	The institutional programs of SEMARNAT, CONAFOR, and SAGARPA maintain their rules of operation and availability of funds Each producer involved in SLM development places at least 7 has under an SLM model
Output 2.1.2: Project profiles formulated and implemented on Replication Units over 3,300 has	Implemented SLM projects Technical assistance sessions	0 0	10 50	30 150	LTA reports Record of technical assistance sessions	
Outcome 2.2	Increased	1.44 ton/ha	Not measurable	+20%	Periodic surveys with	Climate change

Technical capacities for SLM strengthened, contributing to improve the communities' livelihoods	agricultural productivity Rate of vulnerability of livelihoods, as perceived by the communities (LD1-ii)	High perceived vulnerability (2)	High perceived vulnerability (2)	Medium perceived vulnerability (3)	the producers involved in the project	effects are kept within forecast range and natural conditions for production are maintained Each promoter involved in the development of SLM demonstration units advises at least six producers
Output 2.2.1: Capacity-building plans for SLM, with special emphasis on the involvement and reintegration of youth and women with their land	Formulated capacity-building plans Producers trained in SLM processes (disaggregated by gender and age)	0	3	3	Record of capabilities, as recorded by the LTAs and the promoters	
Output 2.2.2: Establishment of an experience exchange mechanism with an emphasis on the youth and women in the 3 micro regions	Strategy designed for the exchange of experiences Exchanges conducted	0	1	1	Exchange strategy document Report on the exchanges that have been conducted (as reported by the LTAs)	
Component 3: PROTIERRAS intervention models systematized, evaluated and disseminated						
Outcome 3.1 Systematized information on project results and other relevant experiences	PROTIERRAS model systematized and consolidated	0	0	The PROTIERRAS model is systematized and	Publication of the PROTIERRAS intervention model	The land management committees and other relevant participants

disseminated at the micro regional, regional, state, and national levels					consolidated		appropriate communication and evaluation strategies
Output 3.1.1: PROTIERRAS communication strategy designed and implemented; with a special emphasis on youth and women	0	15	30	Communication materials designed and distributed	Communication Strategy Document Communication materials (pamphlets, bulletin boards, radio programs)		
Output 3.1.2: Mechanism for knowledge exchange with international initiatives such as LADA-WOCAT	0	2	4	International experiences identified Local participants take part in the exchanges	Reports on workshops of experience exchange at the international level	8	
Output 3.1.3: PROTIERRAS intervention model systematized and published, including lessons learned	0	0	1	PROTIERRAS model published	PROTIERRAS intervention model published		
<u>Outcome 3.2</u> Project implemented on a results based management approach		50% reach in achieving results	100% reach in achieving results	Project results achieved, demonstrating sustainability	Project progress report (PPR) Annual Project Review Report (PIR) Mid-term review and final evaluation		The land management committees and other relevant participants appropriate the intervention strategies
Output 3.2.1: Establishment of a		50% reach in achieving results	100% reach in achieving	Project results achieved,	Project progress report (PPR)		

monitoring and evaluation system	demonstrating sustainability			results	Annual Project Review Report (PIR)	
Output 3.2.2: Mid-term review and final evaluation	1 Mid-term review and 1 final evaluation		Mid-term review	Final evaluation	Mid-term review and final evaluation	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

No comments received.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

NA

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 91,324			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Professional salaries	14,683	0	14,683
Local consultants	55,462	40,005	15,457
International consultants	0.00	0.00	0
Travel	14,337	12,831	1,506
Workshops	6,842	5,821	1,021
Total	<u>91,324</u>	<u>58,657</u>	<u>32,667</u>

¹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA

