
Informe sobre los temas operacionales debatidos en la consulta de la Junta Ejecutiva del 8 de abril

Signatura: EB 2026/147/R.13

Tema: 13

Fecha: 20 de abril de 2026

Distribución: Pública

Original: Inglés

Para información

Medida: Se invita a la Junta Ejecutiva a que tome nota del informe.

Preguntas técnicas:

Donal Brown

Vicepresidente Adjunto
Departamento de Operaciones en los Países
Correo electrónico: d.brown@ifad.org

Enika Basu

Asesora Técnica Superior del Vicepresidente Adjunto
Departamento de Operaciones en los Países
Correo electrónico: e.basu@ifad.org

Informe sobre los temas operacionales debatidos en la consulta de la Junta Ejecutiva del 8 de abril

I. Introducción

1. El 8 de abril de 2026, la Junta Ejecutiva se reunió en modalidad virtual para celebrar una consulta previa a su próximo período de sesiones, que tendría lugar el 22 de abril. Los temas analizados fueron una operación sin garantía soberana con el sector privado (en el Pakistán) y una propuesta de donación al sector privado (relativa a Benin), que se someterían al proceso de aprobación en lote, así como el Programa sobre Oportunidades Estratégicas Nacionales (COSOP) relativo a México, junto con la correspondiente evaluación de la estrategia y el programa en el país (EEPP), que se presentaría a la Junta.
2. La consulta tenía por objeto ofrecer a los Estados Miembros la posibilidad de debatir en profundidad estos temas antes de analizarlos en el período de sesiones de la Junta. La consulta complementa las observaciones que los distintos Estados Miembros habían formulado por escrito a los equipos en los países, a las que estos habían respondido también por escrito.
3. Asistieron a la reunión representantes de 18 Estados Miembros que forman parte de la Junta Ejecutiva¹, además de representantes de otros 4 Estados Miembros del FIDA². También participaron representantes de la Unión Europea y de los Pueblos Indígenas en calidad de observadores.
4. La consulta estuvo presidida por el Vicepresidente Adjunto encargado del Departamento de Operaciones en los Países y contó con la asistencia de la Directora Gerente de la Oficina de Servicios Técnicos; la Asesora Jurídica y Oficial Jefa de Asuntos Jurídicos y Gobernanza; el Director de la Oficina Independiente de Evaluación del FIDA (IOE); la Directora Regional de la División de América Latina y el Caribe; directores en los países; técnicos principales de los proyectos; la Secretaria del FIDA; y otros miembros del personal del Fondo.
5. La Dirección acogió con beneplácito la participación activa de los Estados Miembros y agradeció el constructivo debate mantenido. En general, hubo un amplio apoyo a los tres temas presentados.
6. **Préstamo a Acumen: función, focalización y seguimiento de los resultados.** Las preguntas de los Estados Miembros se centraron en la función estratégica del FIDA, la eficacia de la focalización por medio de subproyectos, las disposiciones relativas al seguimiento y el aprendizaje. La Dirección indicó que estas cuestiones se abordaban en la etapa de diseño y reiteró su compromiso en relación con la transparencia y el aprendizaje continuo, habida cuenta de que se trataba de la primera inversión de capital del FIDA.
7. **Donación a PEBCo: adición de valor y fortalecimiento institucional.** Los Estados Miembros preguntaron acerca del valor añadido de la donación. La Dirección aclaró que la asistencia técnica estaba diseñada específicamente para fortalecer los sistemas con que contaba PEBCo para el seguimiento y la presentación de informes sobre el impacto, con miras a abordar las actuales deficiencias en el seguimiento del impacto. Según lo previsto, la mejora de los sistemas beneficiaría a todas las entidades financiadoras y los donantes dado que con el tiempo aumentaría la credibilidad y la rendición de cuentas.
8. **COSOP relativo a México: armonización con la Política del FIDA relativa a la Graduación de los Países.** Las observaciones de los Estados Miembros se centraron en la armonización del COSOP con la Política relativa a la Graduación de

¹ Alemania, Angola, Austria, Canadá, China, Eritrea, España, Estados Unidos de América, Finlandia, Francia, Japón, México, Perú, Reino de los Países Bajos, Reino Unido, República Bolivariana de Venezuela, Suecia y Suiza.

² Kenya, Luxemburgo, Malta y Ucrania.

los Países, concretamente en lo que respecta a las deficiencias estructurales persistentes, el fortalecimiento institucional, la coordinación y la colaboración en el ámbito de las políticas. La Dirección señaló que se habían reajustado las aspiraciones plasmadas en el COSOP para que fueran realistas y congruentes con un análisis riguroso y de base empírica.

II. Resumen de las propuestas y los debates

A. Operaciones sin garantía soberana con el sector privado

Acumen Climate Action Pakistan (ACAP): formación de pequeñas y medianas empresas agrícolas resilientes al clima (EB 2026/147/R.3)

9. Los Estados Miembros manifestaron su apoyo a la operación sin garantía soberana e hicieron hincapié en la importancia de extraer enseñanzas, garantizar un seguimiento riguroso del impacto, ayudar a las pequeñas y medianas empresas (pymes) agrícolas a fortalecer sus modelos de negocio, y mantener la armonización con el mandato del FIDA. Además, los Estados Miembros subrayaron la importancia de hacer una adecuada labor de focalización y acceso a las empresas que se buscaba beneficiar. Se formularon preguntas acerca de la magnitud de la inversión, el riesgo cambiario, los vínculos con los pequeños productores, la movilización de fondos, el compromiso de los patrocinadores, la visibilidad de la cartera en tramitación y la admisibilidad a la iniciativa AgriConnect.
10. La Dirección confirmó que se establecerían disposiciones adecuadas en materia de seguimiento, incluida la presentación de información desglosada por sexo y edad. Se extraerían enseñanzas en colaboración con ACAP, los coinversores y las empresas en cartera. Las inversiones de capital no expondrían a las pymes ni a los pequeños productores a ningún riesgo cambiario. La magnitud de la inversión, de USD 5 millones, evitaría excluir al capital privado, al tiempo que garantizaría un uso prudente de los recursos del Fondo Fiduciario para el Sector Privado. La Dirección puso de relieve el amplio alcance de las operaciones del FIDA con garantía soberana con respecto a los pequeños productores y la complementariedad del ACAP, la viabilidad del primer cierre con una cartera a corto plazo, el compromiso de los patrocinadores, principalmente de Acumen, con contribuciones significativas del equipo, y la posible admisibilidad a AgriConnect, con sujeción a la participación de la Corporación Financiera Internacional.

B. Propuesta de donación al sector privado

Propuesta de donación con arreglo a la modalidad de donaciones al sector privado para PEBCo BETHESDA Plc por el proyecto de Microfinanciación inclusiva para mejorar los medios de vida y aumentar su resiliencia (EB 2026/147/R.2)

11. Los Estados Miembros manifestaron su apoyo a la asistencia técnica propuesta y valoraron positivamente el gran hincapié hecho en las mujeres, que representaban el 72 % del grupo objetivo. También solicitaron aclaraciones sobre la necesidad específica de asistencia técnica y los motivos que justificaban su calendario de realización. Además, se formularon preguntas sobre la coordinación con otros donantes.
12. La Dirección explicó que la necesidad de asistencia técnica se había determinado por medio del análisis del cliente, en particular en relación con el fortalecimiento del sistema de gestión ambiental y social. El apoyo propuesto se había diseñado para afrontar estas deficiencias de una manera específica y eficaz. Con respecto a los demás donantes, el FIDA estaba en contacto con los asociados para el desarrollo que prestaban apoyo al cliente, y se mantenía una coordinación continua para garantizar un uso eficiente y complementario de la asistencia técnica, en consonancia con las necesidades del cliente y los objetivos del FIDA.

C. América Latina y el Caribe

México: Programa sobre Oportunidades Estratégicas Nacionales y evaluación de la estrategia y el programa en el país (EB 2026/OR/1 + Add.1 + EB 2026/OR/2)

13. Los Estados Miembros expresaron su apoyo al COSOP relativo a México y acogieron con beneplácito la incorporación de las recomendaciones formuladas por la IOE, derivadas de la evaluación de la estrategia y el programa en el país. Se solicitaron aclaraciones sobre aspectos clave del COSOP, particularmente en relación con las políticas de financiación externa de México, los enfoques de focalización, los criterios de evaluación, la colaboración con el sector privado, la medición de los resultados y las actividades no crediticias, entre ellas la gestión de los conocimientos y la cooperación Sur-Sur y triangular.
14. La Dirección explicó que el COSOP difería de las estrategias anteriores por el hecho de incluir una propuesta de valor actualizada en la que el FIDA ya no se posicionaba principalmente como prestamista, sino como depositario de financiación para el desarrollo, a fin de consolidar las inversiones en los territorios rurales vulnerables. La estrategia introducía varios elementos nuevos, como una hoja de ruta para la colaboración con el sector privado, la promoción de soluciones digitales orientadas a promover la inclusión financiera, y asociaciones más sólidas para fortalecer la generación de datos empíricos. Además, en el COSOP se reconocía oficialmente la doble función de México, como receptor y proveedor de conocimientos, en la cooperación Sur-Sur y triangular.
15. La Dirección confirmó que se habían incorporado en el COSOP las cinco recomendaciones siguientes formuladas en la EEPP: i) el fortalecimiento de la focalización de los programas; ii) la mejora de la generación y el uso de los datos empíricos; iii) la promoción de los conocimientos especializados del FIDA en materia de soluciones digitales y colaboración con agentes del sector de las tecnofinanzas; iv) el fortalecimiento institucional de las entidades públicas que gestionan la financiación destinada al clima y el medio ambiente; y v) el fortalecimiento de la colaboración con el sector privado. El seguimiento de la aplicación de estas recomendaciones se llevaría a cabo por medio de los exámenes anuales y de mitad de período del COSOP.
16. En cuanto a la focalización, la Dirección aclaró que el COSOP combinaba la focalización geográfica, la autoselección y la selección directa, dentro de las limitaciones institucionales existentes. Puesto que la financiación del FIDA en México se canalizaba a través de programas públicos conforme al principio presupuestario de no adicionalidad, las intervenciones financiadas con préstamos estaban sujetas a las mismas condiciones de admisibilidad que los recursos nacionales, incluidos los requisitos en materia de tenencia de la tierra y operaciones públicas. La Dirección reconoció que esto podía limitar el alcance a las mujeres y la gente joven y señaló que, por ello, el COSOP promovía enfoques complementarios, como actividades financiadas mediante donaciones, asistencia técnica, educación financiera y soluciones digitales.
17. Se pusieron de relieve los primeros avances logrados en materia de focalización en el marco del Proyecto Cuenca Balsas, que daba prioridad a las propuestas presentadas por los Pueblos Indígenas, las mujeres y la gente joven. Actualmente, el 65 % de los participantes integraban comunidades indígenas, y se prestaba apoyo específico a las iniciativas dirigidas por mujeres. Se preveía que la transición gradual hacia un enfoque de depositario de financiación, junto con una colaboración más amplia con el sector privado, fortaleciera aún más la focalización y posibilitara nuevas modalidades de intervención.
18. Con respecto a los criterios de evaluación, la Dirección aclaró que el COSOP aplicaba los criterios e indicadores establecidos en la Política del FIDA relativa a la Graduación de los Países, en particular la capacidad del país para acceder a capital

externo en condiciones razonables, la solidez de las instituciones y políticas para generar un desarrollo rural sostenible, y el progreso en el logro de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible pertinentes para el mandato del FIDA. También se señaló que las metas correspondientes se acordaban con el Gobierno y servían de parámetros de referencia transparentes y coherentes con las políticas dentro del diálogo y la evaluación periódica de la preparación de México para dejar de recibir apoyo financiero del FIDA al finalizar el período del COSOP.

19. En cuanto a los resultados y los datos empíricos, la Dirección destacó que el marco del COSOP estaba orientado a los resultados, en el sentido de efectos directos, por ejemplo el aumento de los ingresos y del número de hectáreas en las que se aplicaba una gestión sostenible de la tierra. Se aclaró que, al mismo tiempo, se hacía una medición detallada a escala de cada proyecto. Además, se procuraría generar más datos empíricos por medio de asociaciones con universidades e instituciones de investigación.
20. En cuanto a las asociaciones y la cooperación Sur-Sur y triangular, la Dirección subrayó su importancia crucial en el COSOP. Se preveía coordinar actividades con la Agencia Mexicana de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AMEXCID), por ejemplo la prestación de apoyo a la cooperación técnica de México en Centroamérica, e iniciativas para sistematizar y rastrear en mayor medida los resultados de las asociaciones.
21. El Embajador de México hizo hincapié en el enfoque territorial de las intervenciones del FIDA, particularmente para afrontar las desigualdades persistentes en las zonas rurales de las regiones del sur.

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
	<p>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.</p>

Comments from France	Management Response
<p>18. Would it be possible for IFAD14 to focus on the Chiapas State considering its level of poverty?</p>	<p>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.</p>