

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 129

Organization: Centro de Información y Comunicación Ambiental de Norte América A.C.

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Filiberto Penados	129	Mesoamerica	Mexico	12	13	18	43
Joshua Lichtenstein	129	Mesoamerica	Mexico	25	29	24	78

Performance of Eol 129 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The area seems to be located near KBAs

Evidence B: The forest protected by the UZACHI communities in the northern Sierra de Oaxaca has 7 of the 8 forest types present in the region, retains an 88% forest cover, of which 50% is primary forest. Significant biodiversity exists in the area, including over 800 plant species, 527 bird and 76 mammal species, including endangered emblematic species such as the jaguar, tapir and river otter.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: from irrecoverable carbon map of the overall region

Evidence B: The carbon density of the UZACHI forest is not mentioned in the EOI, but the supporting spatial resources puts it over 100 tons/ha.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: the project indicates that there are traditional forms of governance that have a role in management and conservation.

Evidence B: The UZACHI communities have collective title to their lands and a traditional governance system for management of the forest resources, where the community assembly is the highest authority, representation positions are elected and communal labor practices (here called tequio) is still practiced.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: the traditional form of governance of the territory is described

Evidence B: The EOI clearly explains how their respect for the traditions and customs of the communities has led to years of effort to conserve and protect their forest and natural resources. UZACHI has developed a successful model of community based forest enterprises, which constitute an important model for the region.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: The EOI does not communicate a sense of urgency ro major threats

*Evidence B:*The EOI explains external threats including policy change, climate change, out migration and the influx of tourism in the region as well as internal threats including population growth, over hunting, development projects and agricultural expansion.

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: Artículo II de la Constitución Política Mexicana, reconocen los derechos de los pueblos originarios (indígenas), de contar con sus territorios y aprovecharlos de acuerdo a sus usos y costumbres, lo cual, permite a comunidades como las pertenecientes a la UZACHI, planificar y ordenar sus terrenos comunales y organizar las estrategias económicas de aprovechamiento de la riqueza biológica en ellos presente.

*Evidence B:*Policy frameworks in Mexico are generally favorable to IPLC rights and conservation initiatives. While there have been some changes to agrarian law that may put Ejido lands at risk, the national policies on biodiversity, forests and education are supportive of community rights and initiatives.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: NO direct support identified but a number of initiatives that support IPCL-led conservation has been implemented since 1993

*Evidence B:*UZACHI has benefited from decades of support from SEMARNAT to create their successful community forest enterprises.

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: a number of initiatives that support IPLC-led conservation has been implemented since 1993

*Evidence B:*UZACHI has created a successful model of community based forest management and sustainable use, which is widely respected across the region.

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: 2/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: One is listed

*Evidence B:*The EOI identifies private sector co-finance for their forest enterprises and the reforestation component of the project. There are significant in-kind contributions from the communities, and other relevant investments in the region, including through the World Bank DGM.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 12/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 18.5/30

Performance of Eol 129 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: the project addresses vaguely two of the 4 objectives through the following objectives -primera, consiste en complementar o reforzar el conocimiento de la diversidad y distribución específica de fauna silvestre. -segunda línea consiste en sensibilizar a la población local y visitante, por medio de -tercera línea, que consiste en apoyar las labores de reforestación, como una forma de mantener condiciones del entorno natural aptas para la fauna silvestre.

Evidence B: The proposed research, education and reforestation activities are all well aligned with the conservation goals of the ICI.

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: The threats don't seem to be clearly identified and hence the theory of change seems weak.

Evidence B: The three components of the project are well described and the links between the proposed activities and results are clear.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The threats are not clearly identified - whether it is deforestation; climate change.... A number of internal and external threats are identified but these seem to be more factors that contribute to threats.

Evidence B: The identified internal threats, including agricultural expansion and over hunting are well addressed by the research and education components of the project.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Not sure whether the proposed activities would call for the range of investment

Evidence B: The EOL does not specify a budget for the activities, only certifies that they are achievable within the specified budget range. While the scope of the education component is wide (1100 students per year), it seems achievable with the resources available.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The organization is committing to finance the activities of one of the three objectives

Evidence B: The EOI presents \$239,000 in private sector co-finance for the reforestation component.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: from table in question 12

Evidence B: The UZACHI communities comprise 24,000 ha, with another 75 ha under improved agroforestry management

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: no livelihood indicators provided

Evidence B: The reforestation aspect of the project is directly linked to the community forest enterprises and hence livelihoods, there is also livelihoods potential in some of the animal and plant species present in the region which would be better understood through the research component.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: the project indicates that future additional funding will be required

Evidence B: While the EOI doesn't specifically lay out a long term vision, the educational component of the project is clearly a long term endeavor to change hearts and minds over time and UZACHI's long term management of forests for community forest enterprises constitutes a long term sustainability strategy for the communities involved.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: seems to be well aligned with Plan de Acción de la Estrategia Nacional sobre Biodiversidad (EnBioMex 2016 – 2030) de la CONABIO

Evidence B: The project proposes deepening ongoing work that is well aligned with Mexico's national Biodiversity Action Plan and other biodiversity conservation priorities of SEMARNAT

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The project indicates that no differentiation is made. While that may have merit. Treating men and women the same can be discriminatory sometimes

Evidence B: The EOL clearly states a no-discrimination against women policy and approach, but does not take the next step to take specific actions to enhance women's participation or empowerment.

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The project at the moment seems to be weakly designed. It is hard to say.

Evidence B: The proposed research activities would reinforce the conservation and community development activities already underway in UZACHI communities and provide an innovative means to harmonize indigenous traditional knowledge and western scientific research methodologies. Using the research as a basis for hands on education in community schools is also innovative and potentially transformational.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 13/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 21/40

Performance of Eol 129 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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: It is indicated that “CICEANA cumple su misión socio – ambiental al apoyarles gestionando, administrando, supervisando y compartiendo su conocimiento con los destinatarios mediante el proyecto.” In some ways however the IPLC seem to be more beneficiaries

Evidence B: The proposed activities are clearly led by the indigenous communities in UZACHI, with CICEANA supplying some of the more technical know how for the research and educational components.

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: CICEANA seems to work with on the ground organisations for implementation of projects. Uzachi's role seems to that of mobilizing the communities

Evidence B: The UZACHI communities have established a well respected model of community based forest management and forest enterprises, CICEANA also seems to have a long track record of work in the field.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: CICEANA seems to work with on the ground organisations for implementation of projects. Uzachi's role seems to that of mobilizing the communities

Evidence B: CICEANA proposes working with UZACHI, which will lead implementation of all three project components and be subject to the community governance mechanisms present in the UZACHI communities.

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: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Both UZACHI and CICEANA have demonstrated experience and relevant expertise. While they do not have experience with GEF projects, they have implemented projects from the World Bank and USAID.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: has managed similar sized project, and diversified funding

Evidence B: The EOL states that they meet all three criteria.

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: While they do not have experience with GEF projects, they have implemented projects from the World Bank and USAID.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 129 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

