
Report on operational items discussed at the Executive Board consultation on 8 April

Document: EB 2026/147/R.13

Agenda: 13

Date: 20 April 2026

Distribution: Public

Original: English

FOR: INFORMATION

Action: The Executive Board is invited to take note of the report.

Technical questions:

Donal Brown
Associate Vice-President
Department for Country Operations
e-mail: d.brown@ifad.org

Enika Basu
Senior Technical Advisor to the Associate Vice-President
Department for Country Operations
e-mail: e.basu@ifad.org

Report on operational items discussed at the Executive Board consultation on 8 April

I. Introduction

1. The Executive Board met in virtual modality on 8 April 2026 for a pre-consultation ahead of its upcoming session on 22 April. The items for discussion were: a non-sovereign private sector operation (in Pakistan) and a private sector grant proposal (for Benin), to be submitted for batch approval, and the country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) for Mexico along with the associated country strategy and programme evaluation (CSPE), to be presented to the Board.
2. The consultation was held to enable Member States to engage in an in-depth discussion of the items ahead of their consideration at the Board session. The consultation complements the individual written comments shared by Membership with country teams, to which country teams provided written responses.
3. In attendance at the session were representatives from 18 Member States on the Executive Board,¹ along with representatives from four other Member States.² European Union and Indigenous Peoples representatives attended as observers.
4. The consultation was chaired by the Associate Vice-President, Department for Country Operations, and attended by the Managing Director, Office of Technical Delivery; the General Counsel and Chief Legal and Governance Officer; the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE); the Regional Director, Latin America and the Caribbean Division; country directors; project technical leads; the Secretary of IFAD; and other IFAD staff.
5. Management welcomed the active engagement by Membership and expressed appreciation for the constructive discussion. Overall, there was broad support for the three items presented.
6. **Loan to Acumen: Role, targeting and results monitoring.** Membership's queries focused on IFAD's strategic role, the effectiveness of targeting through subprojects, arrangements for monitoring, and learning. Management indicated that these issues were addressed at design and reiterated its commitment to transparency and continued learning given that this was IFAD's first equity investment.
7. **Grant to PEBCo: Value addition and institutional strengthening.** Membership asked about the value added of the grant. Management clarified that the technical assistance was specifically designed to strengthen PEBCO's monitoring and impact reporting systems, which would address current weaknesses in impact tracking. Improved systems were expected to benefit all financiers and donors by enhancing credibility and accountability over time.
8. **Mexico COSOP: Alignment with IFAD's Graduation Policy.** Membership's comments centred on the COSOP's alignment with the Graduation Policy, specifically with regard to remaining structural gaps, institutional strengthening, coordination and policy engagement. Management noted that the COSOP's ambition had been recalibrated to remain realistic and grounded in rigorous, evidence-based analysis.

¹ Angola, Austria, Canada, China, Eritrea, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States and Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

² Kenya, Luxembourg, Malta and Ukraine.

II. Summary of proposals and discussion

A. Non-sovereign private sector operations

Acumen Climate Action Pakistan (ACAP): Building Climate-Resilient Agricultural Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (EB 2026/147/R.3)

9. Members expressed support for the non-sovereign operation (NSO) and emphasized the importance of capturing lessons, ensuring robust impact monitoring, supporting agricultural small and medium-sized enterprises (agri-SMEs) in strengthening business models, and maintaining alignment with IFAD's mandate. Members also underscored the importance of appropriate targeting and access to target companies. Questions were raised on investment size, foreign exchange risk, smallholder farmer linkages, fundraising, sponsor commitment, pipeline visibility and AgriConnect eligibility.
10. Management confirmed that appropriate monitoring arrangements would be established, including sex- and age-disaggregated reporting. Learning would be generated through engagement with ACAP, co-investors and portfolio companies. Equity investments would not expose SMEs or smallholder farmers to foreign exchange risk. The US\$5 million investment size would avoid crowding out private capital while ensuring prudent use of Private Sector Trust Fund resources. Management highlighted the wide smallholder outreach of IFAD's sovereign operations and ACAP's complementarity, a viable first close with near-term pipeline, sponsor commitment primarily from Acumen with meaningful team contributions, and potential AgriConnect eligibility subject to the participation of the International Finance Corporation.

B. Grant proposal to the private sector

Proposed private sector grant to PEBCo-BETHESDA – Inclusive Microfinance for Resilient Improved Livelihoods (EB 2026/147/R.2)

11. Members expressed their support for the proposed technical assistance (TA) and appreciated the strong focus on women, who represent 72 per cent of the target group. They also sought clarification on the specific need for the TA and the rationale for its timing. In addition, questions were also raised about coordination with other donors.
12. Management explained that the need for the TA had been identified through client analysis, in particular with regard to strengthening the environmental and social management system. The proposed support was designed to address these gaps in a targeted and effective manner. With regard to other donors, IFAD was in contact with development partners supporting the client, and coordination was ongoing to ensure efficient and complementary use of the TA in line with the needs of the client and IFAD's objectives.

C. Latin America and the Caribbean

Mexico – Country strategic opportunities programme and country strategy and programme evaluation (EB 2026/OR/1 + Add.1 + EB 2026/OR/2)

13. Member States expressed support for the Mexico COSOP and welcomed the incorporation of recommendations from IOE's CSPE. Clarification was sought on key features of the COSOP, particularly in relation to Mexico's external financing policies, targeting approaches, assessment criteria, private sector engagement, results measurement and non-lending activities – including knowledge management and South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC).
14. Management explained that the COSOP differed from previous strategies in that it included an updated value proposition, in which IFAD was no longer primarily positioned as a lender but rather as an assembler of development finance to consolidate investments in vulnerable rural territories. The strategy introduced several new features, including a roadmap for private sector engagement,

promotion of digital solutions to advance financial inclusion, and stronger partnerships to reinforce evidence generation. The COSOP also formally recognized Mexico's dual role in SSTC as both a recipient and a provider of knowledge.

15. Management confirmed that the five CSPE recommendations had been integrated into the COSOP: (i) strengthened programme targeting, (ii) improved generation and use of evidence; (iii) promotion of IFAD's expertise in digital solutions and engagement with fintech actors, (iv) institutional strengthening of public entities managing environmental and climate finance, and (v) reinforced private sector engagement. Their implementation would be tracked through the COSOP's annual and midterm reviews.
16. On targeting, Management clarified that the COSOP combined geographical targeting, self-selection and direct selection within existing institutional constraints. Given that IFAD financing in Mexico was channelled through public programmes under the non-additionality budget rule, loan-financed interventions were subject to the same eligibility conditions as national resources, including land tenure and public operating requirements. Management acknowledged that this could constrain outreach to women and youth, and noted that the COSOP therefore promoted complementary approaches such as grant-funded activities, technical assistance, financial education and digital solutions.
17. Early progress on targeting was highlighted under the Resilient Balsas Basin Project, which prioritized proposals from Indigenous Peoples, women and youth. Currently, 65 per cent of the participants were from Indigenous communities, with dedicated support for women-led initiatives. It was expected that the gradual shift towards an assembler-of-finance approach, together with expanded private sector engagement, would further strengthen targeting and enable new intervention modalities.
18. On assessment criteria, Management clarified that the COSOP applied the criteria and indicators set out in IFAD's Graduation Policy, namely the country's ability to access external capital on reasonable terms, the strength of institutions and policies for sustainable rural development, and progress on Sustainable Development Goals relevant to IFAD's mandate. It was further noted that the corresponding targets were agreed with the Government and served as transparent, policy-consistent benchmarks for dialogue and periodic assessment of Mexico's preparedness to graduate from IFAD financial support by the end of the COSOP period.
19. Regarding results and evidence, Management highlighted that the COSOP framework was oriented towards outcome-level results, including increases in income and hectares under sustainable land management. At the same time, it was clarified that detailed measurement was carried out at the project level. Further evidence generation would be pursued through partnerships with universities and research institutions.
20. On partnerships and SSTC, Management underscored their centrality to the COSOP. Coordination was foreseen with the Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID), including support to Mexico's technical cooperation in Central America, and efforts to further systematize and track partnership outcomes.
21. The Ambassador of Mexico emphasized the territorial focus of IFAD's interventions, particularly in addressing persistent rural inequalities in the southern regions.

Summary of deliberations on the COSOP for Mexico

Comments from Peru	Management Response
<p>1. Specify the operational mechanisms for targeting women, youth, and indigenous peoples</p>	<p>The COSOP applies a strategic targeting approach—combining geographical targeting, self-selection and direct selection—in line with IFAD’s targeting policy. At COSOP level, this framework provides the overall orientation, while specific targeting mechanisms are defined and operationalized at project level, adapted to each intervention context. Targeting is primarily geographical, focusing on high-poverty and Indigenous territories in the south and south-east, while self-selection and direct selection are operationalized through eligibility criteria, scoring systems and inclusion priorities embedded in project instruments and operating rules.</p> <p>As highlighted by the CSPE, these mechanisms operate within structural constraints, particularly where access to public financial instruments requires formal land tenure and compliance with public operating rules. Because IFAD financing in Mexico is embedded in public programmes under the non-additionality budget rule, loan-financed interventions are subject to the same eligibility conditions as national resources. The COSOP explicitly recognizes that these constraints can limit consistent outreach to women and youth and therefore promotes differentiated operational strategies—including grant-funded components, technical assistance, financial education and digital solutions—to complement loan operations.</p> <p>In practice, projects apply explicit inclusion criteria and incentives. For example, in the ongoing Resilient Balsas Basin project, CONAFOR applies weighted scoring through its Rules of Operation, prioritizing proposals led by Indigenous communities, women and youth. This has resulted in approximately 65 per cent Indigenous beneficiaries, alongside dedicated support schemes for women-led initiatives, including targeted technical assistance delivered by advisors trained in gender inclusion. Complementing the loan, Green Climate Fund grant resources are used to finance activities that are not constrained by public eligibility rules, such as household food security and nutrition initiatives (milpa systems and traspatio orchards) with tailored technical assistance for women, youth and Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p>Looking forward, the COSOP’s shift toward an assembler-of-finance model expands operational space for differentiated targeting through grant instruments, blended finance and private-sector engagement. These approaches will continue to be translated into concrete targeting mechanisms at project level, including through partnerships and financial instruments tailored to underserved groups. For example, a forthcoming Adaptation Fund project under design to mobilize grant resources for climate-resilient coffee systems is expected to reach approximately 9,000 producers, with explicit targets of at least 50 per cent women and 30 per cent youth, supported by measures such as adapted training schedules, culturally appropriate materials, safe learning spaces and</p>

Comments from Peru	Management Response
	<p>local-language delivery. In the medium term, a plausible non-sovereign operation will incorporate targeting through contract design and partner selection, for example, including requirements for tailored financial products for women and Indigenous Peoples for IFAD to invest in financial intermediaries, or employment or supplier-inclusion targets to invest in MSMEs and aggregators.</p>
<p>2. Regarding monitoring tools, how will IFAD ensure a good measurement of climate resilience, productive capacity increases and biodiversity preservation?</p>	<p>Monitoring of progress under the COSOP will rely on its Results Measurement Framework (RMF), which aggregates indicators drawn from the results frameworks of ongoing and future projects, including lending and non-lending initiatives. Progress against outputs and outcomes is reviewed annually through project supervision and updated in IFAD’s corporate systems, providing the basis for COSOP-level reporting in Annual Reviews. As new operations are approved, the RMF will be updated and strengthened to reflect the expanded portfolio and learning.</p> <p>Climate resilience will be measured using a combination of beneficiary-level adoption indicators, administrative data and geospatial analysis. For example, under the Resilient Balsas Basin project, the Green Climate Fund indicator Supplement 2.1 measures the number of women and men adopting improved or new climate-resilient livelihood options, such as climate-smart agricultural practices, value-added processing or savings and loan groups. Adoption is measured through structured surveys conducted at mid-term and completion. In parallel, Supplement 2.4 tracks beneficiaries covered by new or improved early-warning systems, using administrative records from CONAFOR, including systems such as the Forest Fire Danger Prediction System and the Integrated Forest Phytosanitary Monitoring and Control System (SIVICOFF). These indicators capture both behavioural change at household level and systemic resilience at territorial level.</p> <p>Productive capacity and ecosystem recovery are monitored through objective, spatially explicit indicators that complement household-level data. One key example is the measurement of areas under environmental recovery showing improvements in vegetation cover, assessed through changes in the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI). NDVI analysis is carried out using georeferenced remote-sensing data processed through FAO’s EarthMap platform, under studies contracted with IFAD support, and is applied at mid-term and completion. This methodology allows consistent monitoring of trends in biomass density, crop condition and land-use change, providing robust evidence of productivity and biodiversity gains linked to restoration, agroforestry and sustainable land-management practices.</p> <p>To strengthen the evidence base for monitoring and evaluation, the COSOP recognizes the need to move beyond traditional metrics. For this reason, it is taking forward structured collaborations with universities, research centres and key technical partners identified in Appendix II—such as UNAM, Chapingo, TEC de Monterrey, CONAFOR, INIFAP, FIRA, CIMMYT and specialized NGOs—to generate</p>

Comments from Peru	Management Response
	new measurements such as ecological baselines, biodiversity indicators, soil health metrics and remote-sensing analyses that can credibly capture ecosystem restoration and climate resilience outcomes.
Comments from United States of America	Management Response
3. How will this COSOP help Mexico transition towards graduation?	<p>The COSOP supports Mexico's transition towards graduation by focusing IFAD engagement where it adds most value in an upper-middle-income context, while strengthening rural institutions, inter-institutional coordination, and the leverage of additional finance, including private financing, so as to contribute to the <i>country's preparedness to graduate from IFAD financial support</i>. In particular, this COSOP focuses on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing remaining rural challenges and structural gaps: the strategy concentrates on persistent rural poverty, territorial inequalities and exclusion in southern and south-eastern states which are the poorest, including for women and indigenous peoples, ensuring clear IFAD additionality. • Strengthening rural institutions and coordination to promote sustainability: it prioritizes capacity development and coordination mechanisms among key institutions and policies operating in rural areas (e.g. AGRICULTURA, CONAFOR, SEMARNAT, FIRA, SHCP, AMEXCID), promoting policy coherence, complementarities and synergies. • Supporting local actors and organizations to connect with public services, markets and public programmes. • Leveraging additional resources and partnerships to reduce reliance on IFAD over time: the COSOP supports catalytic use of IFAD financing to crowd in public and private resources. • Promoting knowledge, innovation and South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC), positioning Mexico as both a recipient and provider of development solutions.
4. What's IFAD capacity to influence progress towards the indicators established? Why are these useful benchmarks?	<p>The COSOP Mexico applies the criteria and indicators defined in IFAD's Graduation Policy;: (i) the country's ability to access external capital at reasonable terms, (ii) the strength of institutions and policies for sustainable rural development, and (iii) progress on SDGs central to IFAD's mandate; and defines completion targets that are mutually agreed with the Government, as foreseen in the Graduation Policy.</p> <p>The indicators established assess country progress in areas aligned with IFAD's mandate. The COSOP focuses particularly on areas relative to strengthening rural institutions and contributing to address remaining development challenges (connected to the RSPA and SDG indicators). The</p>

Comments from United States of America	Management Response
	<p>COSOP Assessment Framework, indicators and targets are meant, particularly, to provide a structured, transparent and policy-consistent tool for dialogue with the country to assess the country's preparedness to graduate from IFAD financial support at the end of the COSOP period; in other words, whether the country can sustain inclusive rural development without recourse to IFAD financing.</p>
<p>5. Why is domestic co-financing below 1-1 ratio?</p>	<p>The proposed ratio in the COSOP relates directly to Mexico's budgetary framework. Under the non-additionality rule Mexico uses, external loans do not increase the budget ceilings of line ministries such as Agriculture, for example, and the loans must be absorbed within existing approved budgets.</p> <p>This makes it difficult to project domestic co-financing at the COSOP and even project design stage. This is because Mexico's budget is approved on an annual basis, while IFAD-supported investment projects are multi-year. As a result, domestic contributions depend on year-to-year budget allocations and negotiations, which introduces uncertainty over the life of the project.</p> <p>Typically, projects in Mexico at design present conservative cofinancing from the government (Balsas 0.34, PROECOSOCIAL 0.5, PRODEZSA 0.33 to name the last 3 projects). But during implementation based on the project performance and political priority, cofinancing from Mexico increases sharply. Balsas is a good example, from the US\$13M indicated at design as domestic cofinancing, Mexico has spent more than US\$40M by end of 2025 taking the ratio of domestic over 1. Considering the project will still run until 2030, the cofinancing is expected to increase up to 3.</p> <p>PRODESZA included at design only US\$6.3M as domestic cofinancing, however the project closed with US\$14.5M cofinancing from Mexican government, an almost 150% increase indicating the strong relevance of the project throughout its implementation (domestic cofinancing ratio ended at 1.1 considering only final IFAD disbursement amount).</p>
<p>6. Lack of clarity between outputs and outcomes in the COSOP's Results Measurement Framework</p>	<p>The COSOP's Results Measurement Framework (RMF) is designed to capture programme-level outcomes, while detailed results chains and the distinction between outputs and outcomes are defined at project level. As such, the RMF reflects aggregated results from ongoing and pipeline operations, rather than a standalone logframe.</p> <p>At COSOP level, indicators may appear closer to outputs, as they consolidate results across different instruments and stages of implementation. However, the underlying causality between outputs and outcomes is ensured through the theory of change and logframes of individual projects and initiatives, where results are defined and measured in a more granular way.</p>

Comments from United States of America	Management Response
	<p>For projects, progress against outcome-level indicators is systematically monitored through supervision missions and IFAD systems, and this information feeds into the COSOP annual reviews. As new projects and partnerships are developed, including non-lending activities, the RMF will continue to evolve to reflect the programme’s outcome orientation.</p>
<p>7. Urge for IFAD to focus on projects with impact on rural development and not projects that will likely obtain climate cofinancing.</p>	<p>The comment is well noted and aligned to IFAD’s value proposition as assembler of development finance. IFAD will seek to assemble catalytic financing from different sources for the benefit of rural population in the South of Mexico.</p> <p>The COSOP will increasingly seek to attract and mobilize funding from the private sector not necessarily related to climate financing.</p>
<p>8. How will a private sector pipeline be developed?</p>	<p>The COSOP is by nature a strategic document, but it does present clear and actionable entry points for private sector engagement. In the short term, this is done through sovereign operations that strengthen value chains and make them more attractive for private actors; and in the medium term, through at least one non-sovereign operation and supplementary funds targeting the private sector.</p> <p>First, in the short term, the pipeline is created through sovereign operations that deliberately de-risk and prepare market-ready opportunities. Sovereign investments focus on strengthening priority value chains where IFAD has or will have a programme (coffee, cacao, honey, forestry) by improving aggregation, quality, traceability, certification, and climate-smart production systems. These interventions are explicitly designed to generate a bankable pipeline of producer organizations, SMEs, and value-chain platforms that meet private-sector requirements in terms of scale, reliability, and ESG performance.</p> <p>Second, pipeline identification and maturation are driven through structured engagement with the market. The COSOP foresees systematic interaction with anchor companies, intermediaries, and investors through value-chain roundtables, landscape-based platforms, and technical working groups. These mechanisms are used not only for dialogue, but to identify concrete sourcing, co-investment, and financing needs, which then feed into investment preparation.</p> <p>Third, in the medium term, this prepared pipeline transitions into plausible non-sovereign operations and blended-finance structures, from which IFAD could invest in at least one. Once value-chain actors demonstrate commercial viability and reduced risk, IFAD can deploy non-sovereign instruments—directly or via impact funds, financial intermediaries, and fintech platforms—using catalytic capital, and supplementary windows to crowd in private investment. The recent addition of</p>

Comments from United States of America	Management Response
	an IFAD Private sector investment officer in the regional team in Panama will provide specific expertise to support private sector pipeline development.

Comments from the Netherlands	Management Response
9. Will Mexico reach High Income classification during the COSOP period?	<p>Mexico's economic outlook shows steady but moderate income growth, and reaching high-income status by 2031 appears unlikely.</p> <p>In 2024, Mexico's GNI per capita reached US\$12,850, remaining below the high-income threshold of US\$13,935. While income levels have increased in recent years, this trajectory reflects incremental progress rather than the acceleration required to reach high-income classification within the COSOP period.</p> <p>This reflects broader structural factors, including dependence on exports and remittances, as well as emerging demographic pressures, which are expected to continue shaping medium-term growth dynamics.</p>
10. How does IFAD understand the idea of Food Sovereignty at the community level?	<p>Mexico's policy framework defines <i>food sovereignty</i> as the country's capacity to ensure sufficient domestic production of staple foods while improving the livelihoods of rural producers and reducing reliance on imports. This concept is articulated as a guiding principle in federal policy, notably in the Programa Sectorial de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural 2025–2030, which states that public action should "contribute to national food sovereignty and self-sufficiency by increasing agricultural production," and is consistently reinforced across government reports as a cornerstone of rural development strategy.</p> <p>IFAD programmes work at territorial level and will support community level for the implementation of the food sovereignty priority of the government.</p>
11. How does the Non-additionality principle of the Mexican budget affect the impact of IFAD loans?	The non-additionality principle of the Mexican budget conditions the impact of IFAD's loans by limiting their direct financial additionality. Because external loans do not increase the authorized budget ceilings of executing agencies, IFAD resources are absorbed within existing programmes

Comments from the Netherlands	Management Response
	<p>rather than expanding their scale. As a result, loans have limited effect on coverage, staffing, or asset creation, and provide weaker incentives for government counterparts to demand sovereign lending, particularly in a context of fiscal austerity and strong reliance on national financing.</p> <p>This constraint also affects operational effectiveness and attribution of results. Legal and fiscal restrictions associated with non-additionality—such as limitations on hiring staff or financing operational costs—have reduced implementation flexibility and, in some cases, slowed execution and diluted project logic when embedded in national rules of operation.</p> <p>In response, the COSOP 2026–2031 reframes IFAD’s impact away from financial volume and towards catalytic, institutional and leverage-based outcomes. Under non-additionality, IFAD loans are most impactful when they are used to strengthen institutions, pilot scalable approaches, influence policies, and unlock additional non-reimbursable resources—particularly climate and environmental finance—or to prepare ecosystems for private investment. Thus, while the non-additionality principle constrains the direct budgetary impact of IFAD loans, it reinforces a strategic shift toward catalytic impact, blended finance and long-term systemic transformation rather than scale through sovereign lending alone.</p>
<p>12. Non-lending activities in the preparation for graduation. How does IFAD see them, should be there more attention to KM and SSTC?</p>	<p>The COSOP adopts a clear strategic approach to non-lending activities by focusing policy engagement on two central pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the generation and use of evidence and knowledge, and • capacity-building for public servants in key rural, climate and financial-inclusion institutions. <p>Appendix II prioritizes the relevant institutional partners—such as Agriculture, SEMARNAT, CONAFOR, INPI, FIRA, FINABIEN, AMEXCID, UN agencies, research centres and private-sector actors—providing a concrete basis for coordinated analytical work and policy dialogue. Universities and research centres will be approached to develop further evidence required. A partnership-tracking tool will systematically monitor collaboration and report progress through the Annual COSOP Reviews.</p> <p>On SSTC, the COSOP recognizes— for the first time—Mexico’s dual role as both recipient and provider of cooperation. It establishes an institutionalized mechanism through a permanent Joint Working Group with AMEXCID, Agriculture, SEMARNAT, Finance and IFAD, as detailed in Appendix VII. This group will coordinate SSTC priorities, organize exchanges and produce knowledge products, guided by an annual workplan reviewed through the COSOP reporting cycle.</p>

Comments from the Netherlands	Management Response
	<p>Planned SSTC activities position Mexico both as a recipient and provider. As a recipient, exchanges will focus on countries with advanced, large-scale silvopastoral systems—such as Colombia and Brazil—as well as on projects with strong MRV systems. As a provider, Mexico will share its extensive experience in Payment for Environmental Services (PES) schemes and fire management. IFAD is also in advanced dialogue with AMEXCID to provide technical support to Sembrando Vida, Mexico’s flagship cooperation programme in Central America, leveraging IFAD’s portfolio in the subregion, particularly in El Salvador and Honduras.</p> <p>Together, these mechanisms provide a coherent and structured framework for policy engagement, knowledge sharing and SSTC—key non-financial instruments that enhance IFAD’s value added in the context of a country programme informed by the Graduation Policy.</p>
13. Should secure land ownership deserve more attention?	<p>Land tenure in rural Mexico is predominantly social, which has major implications for IFAD interventions. Approximately half of the country’s land—and around 80% of forests and tropical ecosystems—is under ejidal or communal ownership, managed collectively through assemblies. These lands are concentrated in rural and poorer regions, particularly in the south and south-east, and are frequently inhabited by Indigenous Peoples.</p> <p>IFAD’s approach is not to intervene in land tenure systems but rather to work within existing tenure rules to the benefit of its target group in the country. For example, in projects implemented with CONAFOR—such as those in forest and agroforestry landscapes—IFAD works with ejidos and communal landholders, where land is collectively owned and decisions are taken by assemblies. As a result, IFAD supports community-approved investments in sustainable land management, restoration and value-chain development that align with communal governance structures. This allows productive and environmental outcomes to be achieved while fully respecting Mexico’s agrarian law and collective land tenure arrangements, without attempting to modify ownership or use rights.</p>
14. Importance of measurement of ecological impact	Please refer to the response to question 2 above.

Comments from Switzerland	Management Response
15. Is the current Assessment Framework sufficient to monitor progress in strengthening Mexico’s capacity to access capital markets and ensure timely corrective action, given that the only proxy indicator is the sovereign credit rating?	The COSOP Assessment Framework’s first criterion, the country’s ability to access external capital for development , follows a standardized approach across COSOPs where the sovereign credit rating is used as a proxy for access to capital markets and overall financial autonomy. This criterion is the same one used by the World Bank’s graduation policy

Comments from Switzerland	Management Response
	<p>At COSOP level, the framework is designed to capture the direction of travel, rather than provide a detailed monitoring system. In that sense, it complements — rather than replaces — the more granular monitoring that takes place at project and portfolio level.</p> <p>At the same time, monitoring of creditworthiness and financial conditions is not limited to the COSOP framework. IFAD regularly tracks a broader set of macroeconomic and financial indicators through its internal systems, including the BRAM framework, which provides ongoing assessment of countries' financial health and risk profile.</p> <p>Taken together, this ensures continuous monitoring and the ability to inform course correction, while maintaining a clear distinction between the COSOP's strategic role and the operational tools used for implementation and risk management.</p>
16. Indicators on resilience rely heavily on greenhouse gas emission reduction	Please note the response to question 2 above.

Comments from Canada	Management Response
17. Expand on the gender equality and IPs components and how will these be operationalized at project design.	<p>The COSOP is, by design, a strategic framework rather than a project document, and therefore it does not prescribe detailed design features. As such, the full operationalization of gender equality and Indigenous Peoples (IPs) components is developed at project design stage, in line with IFAD's Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP), Gender Policy and Indigenous Peoples Policy. However, the COSOP goes beyond high-level intent by clearly defining strategic priorities, targeting principles, and operational entry points that guide how these dimensions are systematically incorporated into future operations.</p> <p>At the strategic level, the COSOP identifies women and Indigenous Peoples as priority target groups, not only as beneficiaries but as economic and institutional actors within value chains, territorial governance, and financial systems.</p> <p>Operationalization at project design is therefore expected to translate these strategic commitments into: (i) targeting criteria that ensure meaningful participation of women and Indigenous Peoples; (ii) dedicated components or subcomponents addressing economic empowerment, access to services and decision-making; (iii) performance indicators disaggregated by sex, ethnicity and age; (iv) culturally appropriate implementation arrangements, including Free, Prior and Informed</p>

Comments from Canada	Management Response
	Consent where applicable; and (v) partnerships with specialized institutions and community organizations. In this way, the COSOP provides a clear strategic mandate and design architecture, while allowing sufficient flexibility for project-specific solutions adapted to territorial, institutional and cultural contexts.

Comments from France	Management Response
18. Would it be possible for IFAD14 to focus on the Chiapas State considering its level of poverty?	Regarding future interventions in Chiapas, IFAD is currently designing an Adaptation Fund project for USD 25 million. The project intends to target at least 9,000 producers (approximately 36,000 individuals) residing in municipalities across rural areas of Chiapas, Guerrero and Oaxaca States, in Southern Mexico.