



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:	\$6,580,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,406,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	

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	
	2.Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 26, 2014 Yes, the OFP endorsement is included with the submission. 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.

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)
	<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>	
	<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>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
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>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>	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes, consistency with national strategies including the UNCCD NAP is adequately described.</p>	

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<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>GEBs are now appropriately defined.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	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 women groups. It is noted that additional details on roles and process for engagement will be addressed during project development. 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	
	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	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, 	March 26, 2014 The PIF includes elements of innovativeness and sustainability with respect to advancing SLM across multiple scales - parcels, watersheds,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>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>	
	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 achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the breakdown of both the GEF grant and co-financing is appropriate and adequate.</p>	

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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?	<p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>No. PIF clearance cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address concerns expressed in this review.</p> <p>May 9, 2014</p> <p>Yes, PIF clearance is now recommended.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 26, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 09, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

* **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.**