

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Complete the following review with the expert on administrative system					
Management Response: Hiring an administrative expert to make recomendations to improve the project management process.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*		
			Status		Comments
1.1. Elaboration of Terms of Reference to implement a professional analysis in the administrative system of the project in order to recommend improvements for the project management.	dec-2017	PCU/UNDP	N/A	Once the recommendation was analyzed, the Project Steering Committee considered not carrying out the hiring of an administration expert, derived from the following points: • During 2016, the Steering Committee made the decision to make a team transition, which was derived from the various departures of the key personnel of the project, which would lead to significant delays until the new team was hired. • By UNDP regulations, every year audits are carried out on all those projects determined by the Headquarters depending on the range of resources exercised during the year. In this regard, the project has carried out 3 audits so far, which aim to review that the processes are in line with the guidelines implemented by the UNDP for accountability and transparency. • The new administrative work team of the project has collaborated more closely with the different areas of UNDP Mexico to normalize the gaps that occurred during 2016-2017. • A more rigorous monitoring of each of the activities has been carried out and in accordance with UNDP regulations to eliminate administrative delays, which are now up to date. • UNDP Mexico, derived from the Audit recommendations made to the office, is making adjustments and changes regarding monitoring in a systematic manner in order to support the projects, which is facilitating communication, controls and monitoring.	The recommendation is not strategic and is based on the opinions of a delay of the project, that occurred at the time when the project was already in the way of being resolved. However, it will be taken into consideration for the development of an external technical support in administrative matters, which will identify roles and responsibilities to all those involved and not only for the PCU or UNDP.
1.2.Hiring and desk work	jan-2018	PCU/UNDP	N/A		
1.3. Consulting and field work	feb-18	PCU/UNDP	N/A		
1.3. Final inform and Directive Proyect Comittee (DPC) validation.	feb-18	DPC	N/A		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2: One year project extension					
Management Response: Extension request fot 12 months to GEF					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking		
			Status	Comments	Comments
2.1 Delivery of the final report of the Mid Term Review (MTR)	oct-17	Evaluator team	Acomplished	The official request issued by the implementing party was sent on January 9, 2018, giving rise to the immediate collection of information for the creation of the file and drafting of the application, the latest version being ready on June 13, and was the Last July 24 when the official approval is sent.	The evaluation was already delivered, but the recommendations were not enough or robust to improve the project. The analysis was based on perceptions and it does not include hard data to support these recommendations.
2.2 Elaboration of the Management Response and MTR annex note.	nov-17	PCU	Acomplished		
2.3 Validation of the Management Response and the MTR annex note.	Dec-2017	PCU	Acomplished		
2.4 Elaboration of the project extension request for 12 months, including a technical planning and projection to 2020.	Dec-2017	PCU/CONANP	Acomplished		
2.5 Sending the extension request to the GEF.	Dec-2017	UNDP	Acomplished		
2.6 Acceptance of the extension request to 2020.	feb-18	GEF	Acomplished		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3: Promote effective collaboration with other related projects to exchange successful experiences and capacities.					
Management Response: Establish cooperation agendas with other projects related to Resilience.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*		
			Status		Comments
3.1 Hold a meeting with the BIOFIN project to establish a cooperation agenda.	oct-17	PCU/CONANP	Active	The meeting was already held, but non specific cooperation issues were identified	

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Complete the following review with the expert on administrative system					
Management Response: Hiring an administrative expert to make recomendations to improve the project management process.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*		
			Status		Comments
3.2 Link with the GIZ Ecosystem-based Adaptation project	oct-17	PCU/CONANP	Active	The project team has participated in several trainings about this process. These trainings have been replicated to other staff members and the GIZ methodology has been used for the prioritization of adaptation measures	The cooperation will be maintanaed throughout the project, but an analysis for the articulation options will be necessary to identify related issues and processes that require more coordination with other initiatives. We will search the support of other institutions out of CONANP to achieve common objetctives and position the project's achievements.
3.3 Link with the C6 Project	jan-2018	PCU/CONANP	Active	Meetings have been held to discuss the project implementation process and its review mechanisms.	
3.4 Link with the COBEN Project	oct-17	PCU	Active	There is a close cooperation relationship to develop the CCAP (Climate Change Adaptation Program) of the <i>Eje Neovolcánico</i> and achieve its consolidation	
a. Conducting a cooperation workshop on connectivity	jan-2018	PCU	Active	There was a first approach with the Priority Species project in order to planing a forum about conectivity. But, the	
3.4 Coolaboration with the UNDP invasive species project.	ago-17	PCU, UNDP, CONANP	Active	We already had some meetings with this project with the objetctive of improving the process of <i>Resilience</i> Project, and there is a strong cooperation for the implementation of a project in the <i>Cañón del Sumidero</i> (Natural Protected Area).	
3.6 Link with the UNDP Governance Project	jan-2018	PCU, UNDP, CONANP	Active	We are already working with the Governance project on strengthening the Advisory Councils of the NPA.	
3.6 Colaboration with the UNDP Risk Management project.	since 2016	PCU, UNDP, CONANP	Active	There is a close collaboration with this project in the elaboration of all the CCAPs	
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4: Promote actions to access to additional financial support at system, complex and PNA levels					
Management Response: Generate instruments to access to financial sources at ecoregional complex level.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking		
			Status		Comments
4.1 Meeting with CONANP financial area to explore cooperation options for the financial sustainability in the NPA.	Dec-2018	PCU/CONANP	60% of progress	There has been an approach to the CONANP financial Area, however the issue of financial sustainability has not yet been clearly defined within the institution.	The recommendation is generic and is based on the search for external financing sources as the GCF.
4.2 Retake the unattended indicator of the Prodoc related to the "development of at least 4 business plans at the complex level, based on the CC perspective ".	jan-2018	PCU/OC	60% of progress	The indicator has been identified and therefore the investment portfolio component of the CCAP could cover the requirements to be a business plan, this analysis is in process.	The project will develop a strategy in coordination with other responsible areas of CONANP, addressing at least the following options: 1) Public financing based on efficient collection of rights and timely allocation to the areas, 2) Co-financing of other sectors and dependencies with incidence in the territory 3) Productive and economic diversification of the communities in the areas 4) Co-financing from the private sector and / or other contributors
4.3 Conduct a consultancy at the national level, to carry out at least 3 financing plans in 3 project complexes.	march to july 2018	PCU/CONANP/OC	N/A	It is proposed to take into consideration the financing plans perspective at the territorial level and, therefore, it will be sought to implement it in the complex level	
4.5 Executing 2 financial plans at least in 2 of the project complexes.	august-december 2018	PCU/CONANP/OC	50% of progress	A consultancy for the <i>Ocote-Sumidero</i> complex its already hired and developing this plan at the regional level.	
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:					
Management Response: Launch calls for the implementation of adaptation measures at the territorial level to being developed through OSC.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking		

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Complete the following review with the expert on administrative system					
Management Response: Hiring an administrative expert to make recomendations to improve the project management process.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*		
			Status		Comments
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Status	Comentarios	Comments
2.1. PRODOC substantive review	dec-2018	PCU/DPC	Acomplished	The substantive review took place on June 26, 2018 which was approved by the permanent members and guests of the project steering committee.	A substantive review will be made to include the Grants modality in the Project. This is intended to trigger the participation of local CSOs or those working in the project areas to accelerate the implementation of conservation and adaptation actions. At the same time, this strategy will make it possible to leave the bases of collaboration and give sustainability to the actions implemented beyond the project, document lessons learned, empower local populations and actors, among other advantages. It will work in a call and monitoring bases that ensure the achievement of project goals in a cost-efficient manner.
a. Including NGO/CSO as implementers partners.	dec 2018	PCU/DPC	Acomplished		
2.2 Opening in the budget a line for the account 72615	dec 2018	UNDP	Acomplished		
2.3 Elaboration of the ToR for the call for proposals to NGO/CSO	dec 2018	PCU/CONANP/PNUD	Acomplished	The call for civil society organizations was published in July, 47 proposals were received, of which 31 viable CSOs remained. At this moment we are awaiting the contracting of the auditor to evaluate the capacities and risks of these 31 CSOs, to send the 12 technical Annexes to the organizations and to finish the selection process. The agreements are expected to be signed for October 2018.	
2.3.1 Desk work	jan-2018	PCU	Acomplished		
2.3.2 Field work	jan-2018	PCU	Acomplished		
2.3.3Validation of Call for proposals by a specialized committee.	jan-2018	PCU	Acomplished		
a. Validation of the call for proposals by PDC	jan-2018	DPC	Acomplished		
b. Call for proposals publication	jan-2018	UNDP	Acomplished		
c.Evaluation of the technical proposals by a intern specialized committee.	sep-18	Intern Committee	Acomplished		
2.3.5A memorandum of the selection process is drafted and an agreement must be signed with each CSO/NGO and the maximum amount is 150,000	october-18	UNDP/PCU	Acomplished	The CSO selection process has been much more complex than expected. The CSOs that have already been selected and ready to submit their proposals and we have the agreements signed with each one.	
2.3.6. Preparation of the Operation Manual for each selected CSO/NGO	feb-18	PCU/UNDP	Acomplished		
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6: Impulse the Mexico Resilience Alliance					
Management Response:					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*		
			Status		Comments
6.1 Definition of clear objectives and functions to form the technical advisory council of the project (TAC)..	dec 2017	PCU/CONANP	100%	There is a document of TAC functions	We will seek to formalize the TAC with members of the Mexico Resilience Alliance. The Committee will strengthen the strategy and help to articulate efforts with other initiatives and resources It will promote innovation and the search for strategic alliances.
6.2 Invitation by the GdIDP for the Resilient Mexico Alliance to constitute the TAC	sep-18	CONANP/UCP	100%	A meeting was held to reactivate the Alliance, agreeing that this body of participation will be pushed forward during the following year to consolidate on climate change and resilience at the national level.	
a. Conduct a planning workshop with the members of the alliance to define the working program for the second semester of 2018.	october-18	CONANP/PCU	30%	A meeting has been held to resume the work of the Resilient Mexico Alliance on october 18. Due to the change in federal administration, the functions of this Alliance and how to reactivate it have been reconsidered through a survey. It is expected that by August 2019, it will be installed again with established functions.	
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 7: Change the indicator of Purpose 3 (Promote effective management for natura protected areas to reduce climate threats on biodiversity) to "Number of PNAs that have a CCAP and mitigation and adaptation actions within the polygon or in the Complex in which are included "; Baseline: to be determined; Goal: "At least 70% of the NPAs's of the Resilience project have CCAP and actions"; Means of Verification: "CCAP documents publised, technical reports of projects executed or in operation in the Complex".					
Management Response: Change the indicator after doing a detail revision of what has been reported so far					

Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1: Complete the following review with the expert on administrative system					
Management Response: Hiring an administrative expert to make recommendations to improve the project management process.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking*		
			Status		Comments
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking		
			Status		Comments
This recommendation is not supported. The CCAP are already considered in objective 1.3 and the field actions in component 3.2.	NA	NA	NA	N/A	NA
Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 8: Results Framework					
It is recommended to strengthen the RF by focusing on means of verification and indicators in terms of results instead of inputs, and ensuring that the indicators and goals are consistent with the component description and with each other. Specific suggestions have been presented in Sections 2.3, 2.4, 4.3, and 4.4.1.7 of the report. (Action: PCU, DCP).					
Management Response: Carry out a review of the consistency between the PRODOC and the RF, and a review of the previous reports to ensure consistency in the impact indicators for the second part of the project.					
Key Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Tracking		
			Status		Comments
8.1 Integrate the Theory of Change in the Results Framework to formulate all the indicators of the components that need to be more addressed.	dec 2017	PCU, UDNP, CONANP	Acomplished	The review of the RF was concluded and we are working with this harmonized document, without having made any substantial change in the structure as requested by the Project Board.	
8.2 Generation of indicators, components and activities for the objectives that should strengthen your attention for the next phase of the project.	dec 2017	PCU	Acomplished		
8.3 Training the project personal about this methodology of reporting in order to guarantee consistency.	Dec 2017	PCU, UDNP, CONANP	Acomplished		
8.4 Generation of a chronological program to facilitate the management by cycles until the closing of the project.	dec 2017	PCU, UDNP, CONANP	Acomplished		
8.5 Generation of an integrated and improved Reporting strategy, based on the indicators which also allows to issue APPswith standardized criteria	permanent	PCU	Acomplished		
8.6 Training the project personal about this methodology of reporting in order to guarantee consistency.	permanent	PCU/CO	Acomplished	So far the Q1,Q2 and Q3 of the IWP was reported under this new format. After the elaboration of the PIR, substantial changes were defined to the report format, to guarantee having the most robust information in this regard. We will continue with this continuous process of improvement and follow-up to consolidate the reporting system and effectively close the project.	