

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 387

Organization: Grupo Autónomo para la Investigación Ambiental, A.C.

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Jadder Mendoza Lewis	387	Mesoamerica	Mexico	24	29	21	74
Filiberto Penados	387	Mesoamerica			29	29	58

Performance of Eol 387 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score



Section 1 - Experience & strengths relevant to the proposed Indigenous territory, landscape/seascape (Total Points: 30)

A) Importance of the landscape/seascape/indigenous territory for biodiversity, with additional consideration to climate benefits.

1. Is the proposed territory/landscape/seascape a globally important area for biodiversity?

Scoring:

- Not significant;
- Low Significance;
- Moderate Significance;
- Medium-high Significance;
- High Significance;
- Exceptional Significance

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: NA/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The proposal is located in geographic area of high importance both culturally and natural biodiversity and climate dynamics key in Mesoamerica

Evidence B: The areas are within priority terrestrial conservation areas identified by the Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO) and within or adjacent to key biodiversity areas

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

- >50 t/ha - Low;
- 50 - 100 t/ha - Moderate;
- >100 t/ha - High

Reviewer A: 2/2 Reviewer B: NA/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: tropical forests high carbon concentration

Evidence B: not indicated but maps suggest a moderate density

B) Geographical focus in an area under IPLC governance.

3. Is the area held and managed by IPLC under community-based governance systems?

Scoring:

- IPLC governance (rights and institutions) not evident;
- Project areas are marginally under IPLC governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are partially under IPLC systems of governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are largely under IPLC governance, but IPLC rights and/or institutions face significant constraints;
- Project areas are held and managed under IPLC governance systems, with some limitations;
- Project areas are held and managed under strong and active IPLC governance systems

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: NA/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Geographical areas, have recognized forms of tenure for the benefit of IPLC, however the substantive IP rights are limited because of the peasant agrarian approach.

Evidence B: System of ejidos governed by local members assembly with long history of engagement

4. Does the proposal explain the unique cultural significance of the area to IPLCs?

Scoring:

- No explanation given of unique significance to IPLCs;
- Significance of site(s) vaguely described;
- Unique significance of project site(s) clearly explained

Reviewer A: 1/2 Reviewer B: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The project, can deepen the cultural dynamics of the geographical area and the importance of social, economic and environmental organizational cultural systems that may take shape in cross-cultural models

Evidence B: Home of 10 of the 69 Indigenous linguistic groups of Mexico which is 14.5% of the cultural base of Mexico. Each of these groups have a particular biocultural model.

C) Vulnerability of the proposed IPLCs as well as their lands/waters/natural resources to threats.

5. Is the area vulnerable to threats/current risk of negative impacts to IPLC and biodiversity without action?

Scoring:

- No evident threats;
- Low threats;
- Moderate threats;
- Medium-high threats;
- High threats;
- Requires urgent action

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: NA/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: There is a collision threat, little depth about the relationship of the use of biodiversity

Evidence B: The different sites have different threats the range of which goes from moderate to high. These include loss of forest cover, cumulative development pressure such as cultural loss and challenging socioeconomic realities

D) Opportunities for ICI results - including enabling policy conditions, positive government support and presence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up.

6. Are enabling policy conditions in place for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area?

Scoring:

- Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize limited rights for IPLCs over their lands and/or resources;
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: It emphasizes the opportunity to develop strong governance capabilities between base organizations.

Evidence B: The Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2019-2024 (PND) focuses on improving wellbeing, inclusion and the valuing heritage as the basis. It emphasises sustainable development as the new paradigm. The project is constructed with the intent of taking advantage of this legal framework and " cerrar la brecha entre las estrategias productivas que hoy tienen mucha relevancia para el Gobierno Mexicano, y el mantener zonas de reservas claves mediante la integración de esquemas de manejo paisajístico."

Esto hace ver que hay un marco legal de oportunidad indiscutible y que programas como Sembrando Vida, J venes Construyendo el Futuro, Producci n para el Bienestar, entre otros, pueden ser impulsores de las estrategias de manejo activo y sustentable del territorio,

7. Is there active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed country/area?

Scoring:

- National or sub-national governments are actively opposed to IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have recognized the importance of IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments are actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: No amply clear government support, there are indications integration policy actions of IPLC in management development from the kiss and integrate sustainable development variables

Evidence B: its importance seems to be recognised and while there does not seem to be any direct support it seems that there is a supportive framework

8. Are there successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives in the proposed area that provide a foundation for scaling up?

Scoring:

- No IPLC-led conservation initiatives have been implemented;
- Few IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented in pilot stages only;
- Some IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented beyond pilot stages;
- Relevant IPLC-led conservation projects have been well established for many years

Reviewer A: 2/3 *Reviewer B:* NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: there are initiatives gestated and developed in collaboration with IPLC, it is unclear the level of success and sustainability.

Evidence B: The communities seem to be well organised and experience in productive and conservation projects

E) Synergies with existing investments.

9. Are there other initiatives (relevant projects) that provide complementary support for IPLC-led conservation in the geography?

Scoring:

- Few to no complementary projects/investment;
- Complementary projects/investments are small, or are tangentially related to project goals;
- Complementary Projects/investments align strongly with project goals and investments are substantial

Reviewer A: 2/2 *Reviewer B:* NA/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: There is a strong relationship and synergies potential of existing projects, the success of the proposal

Evidence B: 10 very relevant projects are listed.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: NA/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 387 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 1)



Section 2 - Quality and ability of the proposed approach and interventions to achieve transformational impact that generate the global environmental benefits (Total Points: 40)

A) Quality of proposed approach and ability to support traditional structures, knowledge and community practices in the delivery of global environmental benefits.

1. Is the proposed approach well aligned with the overall objective of the ICI to: Enhance Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' (IPLCs) efforts to steward land, waters and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits?

Scoring:

- Weakly aligned;
- Partially aligned;
- Well aligned;
- Exceptionally well aligned

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: It is explicitly focus of the project, based on the productive rural landscape. It has high intension to integrate governance systems already established and strengthened

Evidence B: The project seems to be well thought to contribute to greater capacity of communities to steward their lands and forests, improve livelihoods , improve technical capacities and foster learning across communities.

2. Does the EoI present a clear and convincing set of activities and results?

Scoring:

- The objectives and approach for this project lack clarity and cohesion, and/or do not appear to be realistic for the context;
- Activities & results defined but logic (Theory of Change) is incomplete;
- Activities and results are well-defined and cohesive but some aspects require clarification;
- The project has clear objectives and a cohesive approach with relevant activities for the context and timeline

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The social aspect of organizational strengthening is relevant for sustainability, this aspect requires further.

Evidence B: The project seems to be well thought out even at this stage

3. Will the project (objectives and activities) contribute to overcoming identified threats and putting in place necessary enabling opportunities for IPLC-led conservation?

Scoring:

- Objectives and activities do not clearly address identified threats and opportunities;
- Contributions to addressing the threats and opportunities are low;
- Contributions to addressing threats and enabling conditions are slightly over-ambitious;
- The impact on threats and enabling conditions can be realistically accomplished and are sufficiently ambitious for the projects' context

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The challenges and synergies with processes that are being developed, can directly benefit the scope of the goals of the program.

Evidence B: In terms of investing in four zones

4. Are the activities achievable within a \$500,000 to \$2,000,000 USD budget range in a period of 5 years of project execution?

Scoring:

- Activities/results not aligned with Eol range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There is a clear relationship scope of the proposal with indicators of the program. The geographical scope is ambitious and will only possible leverage resources.

Evidence B: the level of ambition might be over the range

5. Does the Eol include significant and concrete sources of co-financing?

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: There are a variety of financing options

Evidence B: Two sizable projects of high relevance are indicated

B) Potential of the proposed activities to achieve IPLC-led transformational impact that generate global environmental benefits.

6. Are the estimated Global Environmental Benefits (GEF core indicators) substantial and realistic?

Scoring:

- Not provided;
- Very Low (below 10,000 Ha);
- Moderate (between 100,000 - 500,000 Ha);
- High (between 500,000 - 1,000,000 Ha);
- Very high above 1,000,000 Ha

Reviewer A: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The proposal poses a direct goal underrated, should be exploited paper connectivity and indirect contributions larger scale.

Evidence B: NA

7. Are the additional cultural and livelihoods results contributing to project objectives?

Scoring:

- No provided cultural or livelihood indicators for the project;
- Indicators proposed but are not clearly aligned with project goals;
- Indicators proposed and are moderately aligned with project goals;
- Additional cultural and/or livelihood indicators clearly derive from project goals

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There is a recognition of cultural criteria, slightly addressed in the development of the project requires more depth as traditional knowledge is integrated into the proposal and feedback on innovation

Evidence B: the additional indicators don't seem to really focus on cultural and livelihood results

8. Does the EoI provide a clear and robust vision for long-term sustainability?

Scoring:

- Vision for long-term sustainability not provided;
- This project does not seem to have a clear long-term impact;
- This project will create medium-term benefits for biodiversity and IPLC governance, which future funding will hopefully build upon;

- This project will ensure long-term benefits to biodiversity and IPLC systems of governance

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The implementation of the social base, impacts provides medium- and long-term sustainability of practices for sustainable use of biodiversity and climate mitigation is not very clear.

Evidence B: The organizations seem to be strong and well established and the strategy is to strengthen their capacity for conservation in the work they already do.

C) IPLC-led conservation that advances national and global environmental priorities.

9. Does the EoI build on and contribute to national priorities as defined in NBSAPs and/or NDCs?

Scoring:

- Contributions not provided;
- The project is weakly related to either national priorities;
- The project appears to be tangentially related to national priorities;
- The proposal reflects an understanding of the national policy priorities and clearly positions the project in relation to those priorities

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Ambiosio the proposal is not deforestation in areas of the project, however the national policy framework and synergies of Mexico recognizes the goals of the NDC

Evidence B: They seem to be well aligned tih NDC and national priorities in terms of reducing deforestation and restoration of lands

D) Demonstrated gender mainstreaming in all activities.

10. Does the EoI provide a clear and robust approach to gender mainstreaming?

Scoring:

- Gender mainstreaming approach is absent;
- Gender mainstreaming approach is weak;
- Gender mainstreaming approach is moderately thought through (if there are a few activities as 'add ons');
- Significant and well-thought through approach to gender mainstreaming

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: the importance of gender is recognized, it is necessary to show mechanisms and / or strategies to promote better conditions of gender in the process.

Evidence B: There seems to be a high level of experience with gender mainstreaming

E) Innovation and potential to scale up.

11. Do the proposed activities and results demonstrate innovation and potential for transformative results at scale?

Scoring:

- None demonstrated;
- Low demonstrated potential;
- Moderate demonstrated potential;
- Medium-high demonstrated potential;
- High demonstrated potential;
- Exceptional demonstrated potential

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Background driven in the area, show extensive experience and satisfactory results, it is more clear what aspect agroecological and market that cultural social integration of IPCL

Evidence B: The possibility of working on four indigenous zones to bridge economic development and sustainable management of resources could produce important lessons.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 29/40

Performance of Eol 387 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 2)



Section 3 - Qualifications and experience of the Organization (Total Points: 30)

A) Indigenous Peoples or Local Community organization legally recognized under national laws.

1. Is the EoI led by an IPLC organization?

Scoring:

- IPLC appear to be beneficiaries only;
- Combination/partnership of IPLC organizations and NGOs, and plans to build IPLC capacity over the project term are clear;
- IPLC-led approach, NGOs in more limited, defined roles (such as fiduciary);
- Fully IPLC composed and led approach

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: There is a strong integration of IPLC in partnerships with government organizations and NGOs Mexico.

Evidence B: The project seems to be well grounded on the reality of the communities and reflect indigenous priorities.

B) Demonstrated on the ground leadership related to Indigenous Peoples and/or Local Community Conservation.

2. Does the lead proponent demonstrate on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work?

Scoring:

- None demonstrated;
- Limited demonstration of relevant on-ground leadership;
- Demonstrated on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work;
- Exceptional and long-standing on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: He has demonstrated leadership, it is unclear the type of governance mechanisms or processes should deepen the governance framework of the project and how interconnection between the various levels of IPLC especially if they are local governments

Evidence B: Several relevant projects have been carried out by organizations. The quality of the proposal seems to reflect on-ground leadership.

C) Proven relevant experience in working with IPLC networks, alliances and organizations/ strength of partnerships on the ground.

3. Does EoI demonstrate that the lead proponent has strong partnerships, particularly with other IPLC organizations, to carry out the work?

Scoring:

- No partners defined;
- No IPLC partners identified;
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners but without clear scope (roles in project design or governance);
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners with clear roles (in project design or governance);
- Strong IPLC partnerships that play a central role in design, governance, and implementation of the project;
- Strong IPLC partnerships have a central role in design, governance and implementation of the project and linkages with national or regional IPO networks

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: IPLC organizations integrate, it is unclear their role in the design of the proposal and the consultation mechanism in the implementation of the project

Evidence B: the roles seem to have been thought out even at this stage

D) Technical expertise and capacity to address environmental problems, root causes and barriers.

4. Does EoI demonstrate technical capacity of lead proponent and partners to deliver the proposed results?

Scoring:

- No skills demonstrated;
- The skills and experiences outlined have little or no relation to the project activities;
- There is some lack of clarity or some gaps in the capacities necessary to implement the project;
- The activities clearly show how they plan to fill capacity gaps over the course of the project;
- They seem to have adequate skills and capacity for the project but do not have experience with GEF projects;
- The lead organization and project partners clearly communicate that they have all the skills and experience necessary to implement the project activities. Also, have past experience with GEF funded projects.

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Show an organization to achieve the proposed challenges, it is very ambitious. there must be more to coordinate actions specification and quality management mechanisms of processes

Evidence B: Several projects are listed.

E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the EoI demonstrate project & financial management capacity needed for scale of proposed effort?

Scoring:

- Very limited (no criteria met);
- Some capacity but would require support (1/3 criteria);
- Moderate capacity (2/3 criteria met);
- Very strong (all criteria met) with demonstrated past performance

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: Have a history clearly defined, propose 3 patients, only 1 has the scale of the solicited financing.

Evidence B: several sizeable projects are listed

6. Does lead organization have experience with safeguards and other standards required by GEF?

Scoring:

- Answered no;
- Answered yes but with weak or lacking explanation to the extent;
- Answered yes with clear explanation of the extent

Reviewer A: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: no explanation provided

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 387 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

