

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 338

Organization: Coordinadora Estatal de Productores de Café del Estado de Oaxaca, CEPCO

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
338	Mesoamerica	Mexico	21	29	14	64
338	Mesoamerica	Mexico	17	22	24	63

Performance of Eol 338 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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Strategic geographical area connection biodiversity, natural and cultural

Evidence B: Areas of high biodiversity and ecological connectivity; areas of importance determined by Conabio. 540 species of global biodiversity importance

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: Covers low forest area, which suffers from high deforestation that are habitats of a high index keys species conservation of tropical forests and hardened high

Evidence B: map suggests 50-100 t/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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: IPLC governance there is no clear system of community organization itself, has been determining the peasant in Mexico promoted ejido system.

Evidence B: más de la mitad (51%) son municipios plenamente reconocidos como indígenas, con porcentajes de población indígena de 70% y más, y otros de 40% de indígenas..

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The project arises in connectivity with traditional knowledge systems of various IPLC

Evidence B: As an area of importance for indigenous livelihoods is well articulated but it is limited to this.

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: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: agroforestry development and landscape for territorial management is established. Design is key territorial policies

Evidence B: Ongoing economic and social pressures and changes can lead to lower incomes and higher pressure on the land such as the case of coffee.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Agrarista rights are cut, limited in designing IPLC own policies in the management of territoriality. the project can help design social structures d landscape approach articulated by the territoriality as a basis for action

Evidence B: 50 percent are in Indig governance.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: National and subnational government has articulated initiatives that integrate the participation of IPLC, cultural approach as a basis for the design of governance is limited

Evidence B: No direct support but policy framework to support indigenous governance but initiatives by agencies such as the Ministry of Natural resources an agriculture are supportive.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There are several initiatives, it is unclear the role and leadership of the IPLC natural organizations, their participation has surpassed pilot efforts, but its role is unclear.

Evidence B: certification by CERTIMEX which allow organization to position themselves as key actors in the coffee market scene; key role in the Conabio project Sistemas Productivos Sustentables y Biodiversidad; participation in Alianza por los Paisajes Sostenibles y Mercados... etc all provide a foundation

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: 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: There are opportunities with other initiatives, especially sustainability depends on strengthening value chains, the diversification offers use of productive rural landscape, to reduce deforestation and promote restoration of the landscape

Evidence B: 12 projects of relevance are mentioned.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 338 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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: It is very clear in the planned scope, objectives pursued by ICI

Evidence B: It seeks to address the causes of degradation that affect SD of IPs and the economic support for conservation by IPs through improvement of livelihoods through strengthening capacities for production and conservation of biodiversity; productive diversification and access to financing.

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: It is necessary to set as the action from institutions and / or organizations IPLC in fitness project Manner post the ecosystem approach and passage for development ensures cultural identity

Evidence B: The ToC seems to be that climate change is diminishing mesophyll forests which are appropriate for coffee farming which are biodiversity friendly and making the forests available for monocrop and mechanized agriculture which are not. In addition low prices of coffee, loss of remittances promotion means less coffee farming and abandoning of coffee farms shifts to alternatives such as ranching that are contributing to deforestation. The response is to adopt productive practices that also contribute to conservation. Concretely the strengthening of biodiversity friendly strategies through the diversification of productive practices to enhance economic resilience; the restoration of production organizations and incorporation of affected lands to agroecology Clarification is needed.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The goal is clear, your expectation is to the extent of time and resources, it is not clear how to ensure sustainability from the social focus of the IPLC

Evidence B: The proposal is to adopt productive practices that also contribute to conservation. Concretely the strengthening of biodiversity friendly strategies through the diversification of productive practices to enhance economic resilience; the restoration of production organizations and incorporation of affected lands to agroecology makes sense but clarification is needed.

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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: It is accessible to the proposed goals with the resources and time

Evidence B: The proposal is to adopt productive practices that also contribute to conservation. Concretely the strengthening of biodiversity friendly strategies through the diversification of productive practices to enhance economic resilience; the restoration of production organizations and incorporation of affected lands to agroecology makes sense but clarification is needed.

5. Does the EoI 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 synergies of cooperation with government agencies and market development.

Evidence B: 8 projects listed

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: a point blank area of 30,000 hectares is proposed, however it is valuable to consider the diversidad ecosystem to manage.

Evidence B: From indications provided

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Indicators of livelihoods and subsistence are clear cultural indicators are not presented

Evidence B: No cultural indicators provided by the livelihood one that were provided seem well aligned • Cooperativas que sean sujeto de crédito. • Mujeres que han recibido un crédito para actividades económicas diversas. • Nuevos socios de las organizaciones participantes y en vías de certificación. • Actividades de capacitación para la diversificación productiva. • Acceso a

mercados diferenciados para los productos de las organizaciones participantes.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The restoration of the productive landscape generates sustainable medium and long term, it is unclear the governance process

Evidence B: The project is investing in improved agro-ecological production that would sustain biodiversity. If success then the practices will sustain. They may need longer support to strengthen the foundations

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: no compatibility with national policies, it is noteworthy if life plans of IPLC and if there are contributions to these unique challenges.

Evidence B: It aligns with the Estrategia y Plan de Acción Nacional sobre la Diversidad Biológica as indicated, that that refers to the restoration and conservation of terrestrial ecosystems and the development and promotion of tools and incentives to increase areas dedicated to agroecological systems.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: It is considered in access of women to the project, but the development of landscape management with a gender perspective is limited.

Evidence B: It refers to increasing women's access to land but it is not yet reflected in the activities

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Not explicit, the system requires further adoption and innovation culturally relevant actors from the use of the ground.

Evidence B: It is hard to tell from the current description of the project.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/40

Average Total Score: 25.5/40

Performance of Eol 338 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: 0/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: Is presented by an organization and producers, it is unclear organizational IPLC system type.

Evidence B: The organization represents itself and as an IPLC and other indigenous organizations seem to be playing a central role.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: It is unclear process implementation approach with local communities and PI

Evidence B: Several projects are being implemented along the proposed project

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: There integrating production base organization, however the role in the design, implementation and governance systems co initiative from the IPLC is not widely addressed and clear

Evidence B: Several projects are being implmentend along the proposed project

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: No experience in management processes productive rural landscape, there is no evidence that has developed projects with GEF

Evidence B: 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.

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: There is capacity for resource management at the scale of financing ICI

Evidence B: experience managing large projects

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: 0/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: No references

Evidence B: yes with explanation

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 338 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

