



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4353		
Country/Region:	Mexico		
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Mexico		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4519 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2; CCM-5; CD-2; CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,444,953
Co-financing:	\$5,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,344,953
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 26, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Danielius Pivoriunas	Agency Contact Person:	Nick Remple

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?	Yes, Mexico is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 03/15/2011	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A. Cleared 03/15/2011	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Endorsement should be provided using correct format and amounts agreed by focal area. Additional information is requested. 3/15/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP has been implementing the SGP in Mexico for 16 years and also manages a country in portfolio in biodiversity that has focused on similar kinds of project interventions.	

*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 9-8-2010

		Cleared 03/15/2011	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, co-financing is in line with agreed framework for SGP. Cleared 03/15/2011	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>BD: Please provide more detail on staff expertise in the country office in the areas of forestry, natural resource management and invasive alien species.</p> <p>The description of how the GEF investment supports any thematic focus of the UNDAF is not clear at all. Please be more specific on how this project is directly supporting the UNDAF and in what way. Currently the entire description is very generic and vague.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/15/2011</p> <p>BD: March 26, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify what capacity of staff is in the county office areas of SFM, tourism development and IAS. This was requested at PIF stage and is not addressed in the PIF.</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, there are sufficient funds in Mexico's allocation under the biodiversity focal area to support this project. Cleared 03/15/2011	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. Cleared 03/15/2011	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A. Cleared 03/15/2011	

<p>Project Consistency</p>	<p>8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?</p>	<p>BD: Yes, it is clearly aligned with objective 2 of the BD strategy and outcome 2.1 in particular. The project will make a contribution to outcome 2.3 of the strategy.</p> <p>CC*/LSH/Mar 18 11: It appears to be generally aligned, although some of the text in section A.1.1. is confusing or perhaps not necessary. Paragraphs in the text should be numbered, and if they were it would be easier to comment. The fourth paragraph under A.1.1. explains a tie to the GEF SFM strategy. The tie is not necessary because sustainable forest management is a good practice, and therefore these outcomes fit under CC-5. There is a distinction between activities that are common sustainable forest management activities, such as those proposed here, and the formal SFM challenge incentive program of the GEF. The SFM challenge incentive is not available under these SGP related projects so there is no way to report outputs as SFM program outputs. In summary, the paragraph is not needed. *CC stands for climate and chemicals team.</p> <p>BD March 26, 2011</p> <p>The revised BD project framework is generally aligned with the BD results framework except for the outputs related to the SGP focus on Outcome 2.3: Improved management frameworks to prevent, control and manage invasive alien species. The GEF's indicator of success is: "IAS management framework operational score as recorded by the GEF tracking tool". Thus, we are seeking to improve management frameworks for IAS as an output, not certified production landscapes and seascapes. Please revise accordingly. It will be important to</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--	--

		<p>understand how the SGP plans to contribute to improved IAS management frameworks and what elements of an improved IAS management framework. Please also note that the PIF states "the project will address ecosystem degradation by invasive alien species through eradication and control of invasive pathways." You can not eradicate pathways, as pathways are the means by which invasives enter an ecosystem (transport, tourism, etc), but what we are seeking to do is identify the key pathways for entry of IAS and then develop systems whereby these pathways are managed and controlled (border checks, quarantine etc.).</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	<p>September 22, 2010/BD: Yes, project is appropriately focused on objective two of the strategy.</p> <p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: Yes. The relevant objectives for CC are identified for this SGP FSP. Some extra information for clarity: I see that the wording is different for the direct objectives of the SGP, see GEF/C.38/Inf.5, Update on Upgraded SGP Country Programs, Annex II, CC is: Support the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry. However, this is an FSP and therefore it is handled correctly in Table A.</p> <p>BD March 26, 2011</p> <p>Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	<p>September 22, 2010/ BD: Please clarify the relationship between the project's focus and the NBSAP.</p> <p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: Please list how or if this ties into Mexico's REDD+ strategy and perhaps national level forest inventory for carbon. The REDD+</p>	

		<p>strategy should list smallholder level monitoring which is more relevant here. (Ideally, one would expect the smallholder level monitoring to at least not be inconsistent with the national level.) The details could play into the response to #12 and #13.</p> <p>BD March 26, 2011 Relationship to NBSAP is adequately detailed.</p> <p>Additional information is requested 3/27/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	<p>11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: Although it is clear there is a network of NGOs or CBOs of "pivot" organizations, it is not clear that these organizations have institutional sustainability to conduct business without continued support from this program. The table of number of NGOs in the SGP Mexico network is useful, but leads to the question that if there are this many NGOs involved, then perhaps their efforts should be listed as co-financing, in Table IC. Also, GEF/C.38/Inf.5, Update on Upgraded SGP Country Programs, paragraph 16, item c states Mexico is one of the countries undertaking an assessment such that execution by UNOPS of those tasks requiring meeting fiduciary standards [was expected] but other execution services [are] to be provided by a National CSOs. Please add a sentence or two in the text explaining the outcome of that assessment. If a national NGO is involved, please consider including in indicative co-financing Table IC. A "separate credit fund" is mentioned in Section B.3. please describe this fund a bit better. Should this be listed as co-financing?</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p>	

		Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
Project Design	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: Although the background section is extensive and provides much information, it is so lengthy that it is difficult to understand what is important, all the problems seem important and everything seems to be the base project. Please condense and focus this information as a baseline project or at least baseline scenario with problems to address. Also, unless the MIQRO logging company is providing cofinancing, please consider removing the phrase "within the MIQRO logging company" from that sentence.</p> <p>BD March 26, 2011 Please describe in more specific and precise detail existing baseline activities in forest management and the control and management of invasive alien species in the geographies where the project will intervene.</p> <p>Additional information is requested 3/28/2011.</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: It is unclear if the barriers are the problems to be addressed. Please make this section more concise and be clear what the problems are to be addressed with this project.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: In component 2, the CO2 benefits seem high. This is linked with review question 16. There is a reference to an Annex which contains the source of these estimates, but the annex is not included and these estimates are so high as to need some brief explanation</p>	<p>BD March 26, 2011</p> <p>By the time of CEO endorsement, please add biodiversity indicators that will complement the proxy indicators of certification and land-use plans. This should be focused on the 20</p>

		<p>now. In the text please briefly describe the source of the CO2 emissions estimates used (for instance, example sources include using CO2 emissions/ha estimates from Mexico's Communication to the FCCC document, or from IPCC GHG for National GHG inventories, or from publications in the scientific literature (give the name)). Showing a few equations multiplying areas times the CO2 emissions used over the length of the project or years used is all that is needed. For example, listing 1,099,560CO2/yr seems to go with 20,000ha which means 1099560/20,000 and let's say the project period is 5 years so also divide by 5 which means 10995.6 tCO2e/ha/yr is expected, which is 2998.7 tC/ha/yr. This is excessively high on a per hectare basis. For growth estimates, this could be off by a factor of 1000. Please reconsider these values or document them briefly. Also, the framework includes carbon stock monitoring. Please describe in a few sentences or two in the text what the thinking is on how to accomplish that.</p> <p>BD March 26, 2011 Please clarify what certification systems the project will use in the terrestrial and marine realm. Please include the coverage in hectares of the land use plans.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	<p>microregions where the SGP proposes in the PIF to concentrate investment. In addition, it would also be useful to identify the overlay of the sustainable land use plans and their specific objectives with the areas that will attain certification. The SGP could develop an interesting approach to monitoring if there is a geographic overlap between these two sets of indicators.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: My interpretation of the incremental reasoning paragraph as written indicates that the Country Program is the baseline project. The baseline project here should match what is described in earlier sections of the document. Secondly, looking at the network of NGOs in the next section, it is</p>	

		<p>difficult to understand the sentence in this section that says "In the absence of this project, communities will lack opportunities, means and motivation toproduce global environmental benefits."</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: In terms of carbon, please see ensure comments in question 14 are addressed.</p> <p>BD March 26, 2011 Please see comments above in question 14. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	<p>March 26, 2011</p> <p>Yes, this is adequate, however, please revise based on the requests for clarification in the rest of the project review sheet.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011</p> <p>Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011</p>	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	<p>Adequate. Cleared 3/28/2011</p>	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	<p>Ye, sufficiently clear. Cleared 3/28/2011</p>	

	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: In terms of risk, please address the probably difficult-to-change long-standing community land management and use practices (such as slash and burn) which emit much CO ₂ , and how that risk of being unable to change habits may be mitigated. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	March 26, 2011 For the most part, yes, however a number of issues have been identified in this review (identification and description of the baseline project etc.) that require a consistent treatment in the document. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Yes, identified. Cleared 3/28/2011	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: There should be a mention of coordination with any REDD+ activities in the country, or an explanation why not if there is no coordination. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: Please address the concern in question 11, about the possible national NGO involvement that was to be assessed. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	

	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: Project management costs are actual. Please give reasons for the percentage of project management costs to be greater for GEF financing than co-financing, or at least make the percentage the same. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared. 3/28/2011	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	Not confirmed, and not required. However, cash co-financing should be significantly increased from partners including implementing agency. Additional information is requested. 4/5/2011 Additional cash co-financing is provided. Cleared 4/8/2011	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CC/LSH/Mar 18 11: It is unclear because the estimated CO2 benefits currently seem very high. March 26, 2011 BD: Adequate. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Please provide framework to be used. Additional information is requested. 3/28/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	

	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF cannot be considered due high allocation. It has been agreed that every project of upgraded SGP country program will have maximum of 5mln grant request from the GEF. Please make necessary changes and resubmit for consideration. 9/16/2010 March 26, 2011 Please address comments. Additional clarification is provided. However, further details on cash co-financing should be provided. 4/5/2011 Additional information provided. The projects is technically cleared and recommended for CEO clearance. 4/8/2011	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 16, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 08, 2011	

* 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.