

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 202

Organization: Red Indígena de Turismo de México A.C.

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
ARACELY PAZMINO	202	Mesoamerica	Mexico	20	27	16	63
Filiberto Penados	202	Mesoamerica	Mexico	25	25	28	78

Performance of Eol 202 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: La Sierra Norte de Oaxaca es de gran relevancia para la biodiversidad y de altísima riqueza de los pueblos indígenas mexicanos. Está descrita como una Región terrestre prioritaria.

Evidence B: part of hot spot

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Según mapa. Hay zonas que están en Bajo pero en su mayoría se evidencia el color correspondiente a moderado.

Evidence B: from irrecoverable carbon map

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Si de acuerdo a sus sistemas propios de organización y gobierno.

Evidence B: there seem to be strong community action that has resulted in in strong governance systems and legal systems that guarantee it

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Es suficientemente explicito.

Evidence B: The communities have been able to sustain and revitalize governance systems and livelihood patterns that are intimately connected to the area that have been recognise nationally and internationally

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: La identificación de amenazas es bien clara así como su justificación.

Evidence B: the threats seem to be deforestation, water loss, climate change and growing extractive interests. The communities have been able to defend themselves against these through collective action, strengthening governance and creating economic opportunities. Without consolidating the latter two they remain vulnerable.

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: 2/3 *Reviewer B:* 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: A nivel normativo si existe suficientes condiciones para el desarrollo de acciones y gobernanza, sin embargo, siempre existen vacíos, por esta razón le doy esa calificación.

Evidence B: high level of organization; initiatives to bolster territorial planning for sustainable development; and initiatives to diversify the economy offer a solid foundation to build on.

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:* 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Si existen algunas iniciativas que aglutinan diversos niveles de interacción con el estado y con otras asociaciones/agremiaciones.

Evidence B: Plans and actions related to international commitments as reflected in the Estrategia Nacional sobre Biodiversidad de México (ENBioMex) que incluye un Plan de Acción 2016-2030 and national laws which recognise rights in the area of influence and specific state funding mechanisms suggest support

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Si, de acuerdo a la descripción.

Evidence B: The communities have been very active. The level of collective action; initiatives to bolster territorial planning for sustainable development; and initiatives to diversify the economy offer a solid foundation to build on.

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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Se describen varias iniciativas. En términos concretos de cofinanciación se menciona capital social y de infraestructura para el desarrollo del proyecto.

Evidence B: Two of the projects listed seem very relevant and national funding schemes are identified


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 202 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: El desarrollo de la propuesta está directamente enfocada para el fortalecimiento de la gobernanza de los sitios participantes y de los pueblos zapotecas y chinantecos.

Evidence B: Three of the IC initiative are addressed. The project revolves around safeguarding forests in relation to traditional medicine, increasing knowledge and appreciation for and developing economic opportunities around the same.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: NA/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: El proyecto está bien definido y tiene elementos muy claros que alcanzar. Inclusive el nivel de detalle permite determinar el alcance y lo que buscan desarrollar.

Evidence B: The project revolves around safeguarding biodiversity and indigenous knowledge in relation to traditional medicine, increasing knowledge and appreciation for and developing economic opportunities around the same with particular attention to the participation and benefits for women and youth. These seem very cohesive.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Me parece que el diseño permite abordar los aspectos que ellos identificaron como amenazas y están enfocados en fortalecer los medios de vida de las poblaciones.

Evidence B: The project revolves around safeguarding biodiversity and indigenous knowledge in relation to traditional medicine, increasing knowledge and appreciation for and developing economic opportunities around the same with particular attention to the participation and benefits for women and youth. This would seem in greater commitment to sustain the kind of actions that have served the communities well

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Habría que desarrollar el presupuesto en detalle pero es bastante posible.

Evidence B: NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Creo que están alineados y pueden ser apoyados con acciones locales y otras iniciativas, sin embargo, el cofinanciamiento que ellos mencionan es de capital social y de infraestructura por lo cual no estaría tan claro si cuentan con fuentes adicionales de cofinanciamiento.

Evidence B: The projects and sources identified are general and moderate

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: Se mencionan 62.950 Ha.

Evidence B: as indicted in table in question 12

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: Están identificados y creo que son adecuados con el diseño pero creo que faltan algunos indicadores resultantes del proceso de implementación que podrían incluirse.

Evidence B: the indicators are well aligned but livelihood indicators were not provided

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Me parece que si está enfocado al fortalecimiento de la gobernanza y de los medios de vida de estas poblaciones, sin embargo el enfoque de sostenibilidad no me queda claro ya que requiere que se sigan construyendo a medida que se implementa el proyecto.

Evidence B: The investment in youth and women, the instrumentation of safeguards and economic opportunities are proposed. economic benefits from traditional medicine will yet be determined

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: Si, la propuesta está alineada con lo que detallan (Plan estratégico de la CBD) y para la estrategia de biodiversidad de México.

Evidence B: The project is aligned with: Meta 18 Plan Estratégico para la Diversidad Biológica 2011-2020 and;

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: El diseño en la propuesta está muy bien contemplada. La respuesta de la pregunta 15 también. En ambos casos se evidencia que se ha realizado una integración técnica y que además de haberla integrado ha incorporado un enfoque de jóvenes a través de acciones intergeneracionales que son fundamentales para la reproducción de la cultura. Es fundamental este enfoque y lo han integrado adecuadamente.

Evidence B: the participation of women is a central goal of the project

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Se plantea claramente un potencial para la movilización de replicas y de compartir resultados a mayores escalas, sin embargo no la considero innovadora.

Evidence B: The central role of traditional medicine is innovative


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/40

Average Total Score: 26/40

Performance of Eol 202 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Es una Red Indígena dedicada a acciones vinculadas a turismo y su implementación será de los asociados de las comunidades. No hay asociados externos.

Evidence B: The organization is a coordinating IPLC and member organizations are local IPLCs

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Tienen varios proyectos e iniciativas que los manifiestan como alineados y en colaboración con ellos. Sin embargo, no es muy claro su nivel de liderazgo en varias de esas iniciativas.

Evidence B: The organization is an IPCL that has coordinating experience at national and global level. AT the local level it has experience with work such as: En los años 2017, 2018 y 2019 facilitamos el proceso para la realización de 15 Protocolos Comunitarios Bioculturales en igual número de comunidades, en coordinación con las Autoridades Comunitarias, el Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo-México, y la Secretaría del Medioambiente y Recursos Naturales.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Me parece que el enfoque y el diseño es para la realización de acciones concretas del liderazgo (y fortalecimiento) de la red. Y por lo tanto, la red y sus asociados.

Evidence B: It is national coordinator with experience working at local level as demonstrated in the following experience: En los años 2017, 2018 y 2019 facilitamos el proceso para la realización de 15 Protocolos Comunitarios Bioculturales en igual número de comunidades, en coordinación con las Autoridades Comunitarias, el Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo-México, y la Secretaría del Medioambiente y Recursos Naturales.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Se contesta afirmativamente pero no es claro si han ejecutado fondos GEF.

Evidence B: Has experience with actions at national, international and local level. and has indicated a set of qualified professionals that would be involved in the project implementation

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Idem, arriba.

Evidence B: at least one of the projects is over 200,000US and has produced audits

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: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Si pero creo que la experiencia es con otro tipo de fondos.

Evidence B: yes.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 202 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

