

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 189

Organization: Sembrando Semilla Sagrada AC.

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
ARACELY PAZMINO	189	Mesoamerica	Mexico	20	12	16	48
Yolanda Teran	189	Mesoamerica	Mexico	29	33	30	92

Performance of Eol 189 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: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: It is the coastal plain south of the Gulf of Mexico. It is a territory with a particularly large endemism of the area and considered the largest in the country, besides being a biosphere reserve (Las Tuxtlas).

Evidence B: The proposal aims to implement in Mexico, in the state of Veracruz, in the biosphere reserve Los Tuxtlas. It has an area of 155,000 hectares. It features diverse habitats, different types of flora and fauna.

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

Reviewer A: 0/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: an area on the map is evident at low carbon density conditions

Evidence B: Tuxtla Biosphere has lakes, streams, waterfalls, wetlands, lagoons, rivers, birds, endemic species of flora, world natural heritage ecosystems. It has different types of ecosystems and forests, in areas of conservation and restoration capture carbon dioxide.

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: It is a territory with its own forms of organization and governance. However, there are always limitations on full implementation of its decisions.

Evidence B: It is a cradle territory of the Olmeca and Teotihuacan culture. They are living in historically diverse Aboriginal Peoples and migrants. There is a community management of the Nahua communities. The land has cultural significance within communities that are governed by the Assembly.

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: They have an excellent explanation of the cultural value of this town, its organization, its government, the relationship with the territory and ritualism.

Evidence B: They have a cultural legacy of the Olmec and Teotihuacan culture. There are archaeological remains of agricultural production techniques. All year are made thanks to Mother Earth for the harvest, blessing of seeds, rituals rain, offerings to "Chanej" guardian of the people, Mother Laguna guardian of fishing, the Great Sea, lady offers protection and food

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: They determine clearly threats and justified in the context of its territory. But threats are common to many other sites. properly integrated as threatening situation created by the COVID 19. What if particular is worth mentioning infrastructure threats that this area may face and that could be disastrous for their environmental and social reality.

Evidence B: There are threats caused by the change of use of the forests for farming land, inadequate management of solid and organic, wood extraction, forest fires, loss of vegetation, pollution of rivers and springs, conflicts over access to resources, distance between communities due to the COVID

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: There are legal conditions and adequate regulations, but de facto there is always missing implementing regulations or limit the application conditions.

Evidence B: They have worked in the conservation community for over 35 years and have replanted mangroves. They have developed projects with the World Bank and institutions of Mexico. They implemented the GEF-UNDP project -SEMARNAT the Nagoya Protocol.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: If several detailed and show some projects and initiatives that support leadership processes and implementation of projects like these.

Evidence B: The proposal is part of the National Biodiversity Strategy of Mexico (ENBioMex) and Action Plan 2016-2030. Is a proposal that is payable to the global conservation of areas with high biodiversity from local

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: If relevant initiatives and projects that have benefits for indigenous peoples of these areas are set.

Evidence B: The region of the biosphere reserve in the Cerro San Marthin Pajapan has been preserved for more than 35 years in communal regime also lagoon oysters and mangroves have been replanted in the interest of the Nahua communities. They participated in the development of Biocultural Community Protocol to protect and safeguard biological resources in situ genetic and traditional knowledge associated

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: Mentioned least 3 asociacios the projects and possibilities are listed to gain support of some projects, however, they are not necessarily effective potential.

Evidence B: 4 are running community projects related to conservation and sponsored by the National Institute for the Development of Indigenous Peoples. They could count on the future support of the Commission of Protected Areas, of the INPI cooperation providing for community projects and climate change


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/30

Average Total Score: 24.5/30

Performance of Eol 189 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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposal is generally well aligned with the purpose of achieving strengthen indigenous peoples linked to this proposal. However, it has serious weaknesses in the design of the proposed specific (results framework-activities)

Evidence B: The proposal will work on important issues of restoration, protection, conservation territories PICLs and sustainable use of natural resources. It made a series of participatory activities to achieve the well-being of communities and ensure their participation including indigenous women

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 ideas are excellent and clearly articulate and justify the threats. But is a list of ideas that lack respect, articulation, scope and purpose. They are a list of actions or statements that are not understood. Generally if reads are good but are not designed as achieved. I did not give the lowest rating because they are interesting ideas (which could be worked to be submitted).

Evidence B: The proposal mentions various activities but does not indicate clearly either the objectives or results. In paragraph 9 highlights the long-term activities to support PICLs. There is a mix of activities and results

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: They are linked but it is unclear how they will be achieved and therefore as will the contribution.

Evidence B: The proposed activities will serve to recovery and conservation of important ecosystems for biodiversity and for the life of the PICLs. Equally contribute in empowering communities through their own governance systems and practice of indigenous spirituality and healthy relationships between PICLs and those with Mother Earth

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: 0/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: It's not clear

Evidence B: The proposed activities will be implemented within five years with a budget of \$ 2 million (need to clearly define the expected results)

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;

- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: If some initiatives and associated projects arise. In addition they mentioned aspects to be considered as co-funding but are potential to be achieved.

Evidence B: Executes projects with national funds from the INPI and the Ministry of the Environment. A future could count on the co-financing of the National Protected Areas Commission and the INPI (community projects, tourism, climate change)

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: It is mentioned in the matrix 2229 has about 1000 beneficiaries.

Evidence B: The proposal indicates a total area of 2,229 hectares. Estimated number of direct beneficiaries of 1,000 people

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: relationship is but it is not clear how reach.

Evidence B: It features 8 additional indicators arising from the proposed activities

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: some interesting ideas but the design of the results framework and activities do not allow us to understand how they will do arise.

Evidence B: Indigenous communities already have a culture with environmental, Sr. efficiency contributed its own initiative in the conservation and preservation of natural resources for several years. Work has been persistent and consistent and has always developed either local or external funds

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: They are mentioned but are limited potential contributions.

Evidence B: The proposal is in line with the National Biodiversity Strategy of Mexico (ENBioMex) and the Plan of Action 2016-2030. Similarly it relates to the adaptation component of the social sector to climate change in Mexico NDC

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: adequate disclosure is made in question 15 but it is not clear through design under resultados.

Evidence B: The following activities are mentioned to include the gender component in the proposal: - Identification of different activities - Process support with a focus on gender throughout the project. - Capacity building for effective communication - Generation of spaces for dialogue of women, health, economies and effective participation among others - It is intended that with the focus on gender relations promote the harmonious use of land care and sustainable use of biodiversity and its contribution to humanity

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: 0/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: It's not clear.

Evidence B: The land has great cultural significance for PICLs of the proposal. Have their own systems of governance are running conservation projects. Community feel the responsibility to ensure the care and conservation of its territory. The proposed activities are to achieve the collective welfare of PICLs and conservation of a healthy and harmonious territory


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 12/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 33/40

Average Total Score: 22.5/40

Performance of Eol 189 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: According to the proposal is an association between an indigenous organization representantiva and 17 associated organizational bodies.

*Evidence B:*Seed Sowing the indigenous organization Sagrada AC. of Mexico works with a network of indigenous associations, each of which contribute to the proposed indigenous professionals and with different types of experience. The proposal comprised 17 partner organizations

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: If you have made some examples of important initiatives and actions to leadership in these areas they arise.

*Evidence B:*The organization has one or more projects led by PICL from local field offices. It has implemented a project with the World Bank 100 million dollars. It has a project underway with the Gulf of Mexico Fund AC \$ 100,000 which will end in 2022

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: potential partners are listed but it is unclear how the project would be carried forward.

Evidence B: The proposal will have 17 organizations with local and national ties. Among its partners mentioned INPI, the Ministry of Environment of the state of Veracruz, the City of Pajapan and INANNA B.C.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: It is presented in a descriptive manner but it is unclear how it would perform. A list of partners is made but it is not clear how this interaction would be conducted.

Evidence B: If the organization has implemented projects funded by the GEF. It is an interagency effort of the National Commission on Protected Areas (CONANP), the Commission Nacional Forestal (CONAFOR), the National Institute of Ecology (INECC), and the Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN) with co-financing from the Fund Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the World Bank.

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: It is mentioned that can handle approximately 150K a year, however, the list of projects handled shows an approximate value of 80k a year.

Evidence B: The organization has a budget of 100,000 to 1 million dollars per year. Funding for the organization comes from five sources at the least, with none of them exceed 40%. The organization produces regular reports and financial statements, which provides board and administration, and usually be complete and delivered on time. External audits are performed annually and apply the recommendations

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: They say that if and should be for the experience in participating in a GEF initiative on ABS. No further explanation.

Evidence B: The organization if you have experience working with the GEF (GEF 6) through a project on coastal watershed conservation in the context of climate change funded by the World Bank last 60 months. The project was completed in 2019. Objective: To promote integrated environmental management of selected coastal watersheds as a way to conserve biodiversity, contribute to mitigating climate change and improve the sustainable use of soil

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 189 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

