

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 122

Organization: Asociación Comunidad Indígena Poqomam de Palin.

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Yolanda Teran	122	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	29	32	25	86
Joshua Lichtenstein	122	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	21	29	27	77

Performance of Eol 122 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Poqomam Indigenous Community of Palin (CIP), since the founding of the town of Indians of the town of Palín (1570 approx), has been identified with the community management of the Nah 'Yuuq o Chilar forest. This forest is located in a parallel coast to the Pacific coast it has wet and dry forests.

Evidence B: The forest area protected by CIP is relatively small (3755 ha), but sounds like one of the last remainders of primary forest in the area. The significance of the El Chilar forests sounds like it is more important because of the well established model of traditional management and the possibility to create connectivity with other forest patches in the area.

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Studies at the University of Guatemala define the Chilar the forest as an important reservoir of biodiversity and carbon. There is an annual fixation of carbon in the forest of 415 tons per hectare.

Evidence B: CIP has undertaken carbon measurements of their forest along with university partners and have identified very high carbon values- 415 tons/ha/yr, which is much higher than the average surrounding forest carbon values.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: IPC was the first indigenous community in Guatemala who recorded his name 3,755 hectares of privately owned forest as indigenous community. The board convenes different assemblies. Each community cultivates a plot of subsistence in the forest

Evidence B: The El Chilar forest has been managed and protected by the Poqomam Maya for hundreds of years (since at least 1570) through a very strong indigenous traditional governance system. The area is legally recognized as collective property since 2013.

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: The forest is a living, family and commercial production. It has all the structures of a traditional indigenous community. It has 6 major sacred sites and 13 altars, cultural elements essential for the practice of spirituality of Peoples. The title of the forest was delivered to children and elders of the CIP

Evidence B: The unique significance of the site is well explained- as the Poqomam Maya are deeply attached to their territory which holds a number of Maya sacred sites in addition to the forest and biodiversity resources.

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

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

Scoring:

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

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The region despite being surrounded by geographical barriers suffers threats from activities created outside this and are not compatible with the conservation of biodiversity. The threats are: extensive grazing, extensive cultivation of sugarcane, housing developments, highways and large industrial extensions. Climate change is also a threat to the forest and the livelihoods of the community. Migration is also a threat

Evidence B: The deforestation and degradation threats are mostly kept at bay by regular patrolling and exclusion of outsiders from the forest, if those efforts slackened however, the forest would be at high risk from peri-urban expansion, agriculture, ranching and illegal logging. The main ongoing threat cited by the EOI is the isolation of the forest from connectivity with other intact forest patches in the area, creating an island effect that is negatively impacting the sustainability of the plant and animal species in the forest.

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

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: the community has various committees throughout the forest area. Each president holds the keys to the locks that open the gates that block the road in every sector of the bosque. Each year produces a Forest Management Plan which is approved by the Assembly. In 2015 the Government of Guatemala awarded the Medal Presidential Environment.

Evidence B: Guatemalan public forest policy is a mixed bag– there are important advances in the legal framework over the past few decades, including an important forest incentive program and the recognition of indigenous rights and the importance of traditional knowledge. Implementation of these policies on the ground however is weak and undermined by lack of government capacity, political will, corruption and weak intersectoral coordination. Despite decades of effort, the legal recognition of indigenous lands is still very slow and incomplete. Violence against indigenous land defenders is common.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The National Forestry Institute supports a municipal forester supporting registration processes to the National Forestry Incentive Program. There is a legal framework that allowed the Community Poqomam Indian Palín register the Nah 'Yuuq collective privately owned forest as being an unprecedented case in the country. Guatemala is part of the Convention 169 and the UN Declaration on Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples, UNDRIP.

Evidence B: The Government of Guatemala has supported some IPLC led conservation efforts, including the important experience with the community forest concessions in the Peten, but has disrupted and undermined others such as Semuc Champey. The Government has recognized the success of IPLC conservation efforts in El Chilar and awarded them a Presidential Conservation Award in 2015.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The successful management of the CIP has been recognized by the State of Guatemala through the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources have added awarded the Presidential Medal of Environment in 2015. The CIP takes care of the forest since 1873.

Evidence B: Guatemala has many relevant and well established conservation initiatives, including the community concessions in the Peten and other historic indigenous traditional conservation areas such as the forest of Totonicapan and the forests of Huehuetenango.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: There are three existing organizations which could account for the development of activities related to the proposal. Also could collaborate with economic resources.

Evidence B: While there are some larger scale investment projects in Guatemala, few appear to be in this area close to Guatemala City and the CIP does not report major co-financing for their proposed efforts.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 122 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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: They propose activities that have the approval of the Board and has technical studies. Mention the establishment of biological corridors, selling carbon (avoided deforestation), payment for environmental services and strengthening conservation, management and utilization of forest products. Also they propose three complementary subcomponents. The long-term goal of CIP is the proper management of the forest. The proposed activities are related to the main themes of the draft ICI. The CIP needs support to preserve their culture and the forest is their livelihood

Evidence B: The proposed actions by the CIP to protect the El Chilar forest are very well aligned with the overall objectives of the ICI. This is an area with a long standing indigenous traditional conservation model, strong local governance and deep community buy in for conservation of their forest resources. The community is strongly rooted to their territory and the forest has high cultural significance.

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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The proposal has four main activities and clear investment results on the ground. Similarly describes three subcomponents with corresponding activities for organizational strengthening

Evidence B: The objectives of the proposal are clear. Strengthening the traditional governance and conservation activities are feasible and achievable, and established some long term revenue generating activities- such as payments for environmental services such as water and carbon would appear to be a good way forward. I am less clear about the feasibility of establishing

biological corridors to other remaining forest patches, and the student scholarship program would appear to be an expensive and long term approach that might be hard to measure impact in the short term.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Objectives, activities and results are clear and achievable both to support the survival of the CIP and conservation of the forest ecosystems and ancient sacred sites of great cultural significance

Evidence B: The CIP proposed activities are well aligned to the threats and are mostly achievable, especially those around consolidating and providing long term sources of revenue for the traditional governance and protection model. I am not familiar enough with the area to judge the feasibility of the biological corridors proposal, which however seems quite ambitious given the expansion of urban areas and commercial agriculture in the immediate surroundings.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Activities and results are in line with the investment range of EOL. The CIP perform activities within the five-year duration of the project with the allocated budget

Evidence B: The budget appears to be sufficient to support the proposed core conservation activities and expand work on carbon and water payment for environmental services. There is not enough detail on how the proposed biological corridors would be accomplished to assess the adequacy of the budget for those activities. The administrative costs for the scholarship program exceed the amount of resources to be re-granted, so possibly some cost reductions should be sought there.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: He mentioned as potential partner organizations and co-financing: Community Forestry Association of Guatemala Utz Che 'Rafael Landivar University, Municipality of Palin, National Forest Institute INAB FAUSAC. Also it refers to the headquarters of the CIP and payment of wages.

Evidence B: The proposal does not include concrete co-financing, and CIP appears to have a low budget as an organization. They have received support before from both the public and private sectors as well as foundations, and have some important links with national organizations (Utz Che), universities and the private sector.

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: 1/5

Average: 1/5

Evidence A: It proposes an area of 3,755 hectares with improved practices

Evidence B: The area of the El Chilar forest is 3755 ha.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Indicators on the protection and conservation of the Maya altars and sacred sites. It increases forest cover with native species

Evidence B: There are a number of cultural activities (community governance, protection of sacred sites) which are intrinsic to the project, and a number of others- support for women's empowerment, long term capacity building (student scholarships) which add significant potential results to the project. The proposed financial sustainability activities, including payments for environmental services of water and carbon, also add important potential livelihoods results.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Consultation, training and the definition of priorities and activities of the project will be defined from the beginning of the same. The goal is to provide tools for self-management and maintenance of the project

Evidence B: The project is definitely rooted in a long term vision for protection of the El Chilar forest, and if successful, would provide for the sustainability of the conservation results achieved thus far.

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: The proposal is consistent with the National Biodiversity Policy and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2012-2022. In 2015 Guatemala proposed 2030 emissions reduction to 11.2%

Evidence B: While it is a relatively small area, the project represents an important model of indigenous community led conservation, based on centuries old traditional practices and a forest governance model that is a national priority within Guatemala's NBSAP. The EOI summarizes those linkages well and explains how the project would contribute to the achievement of Guatemala's 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: She explains that women can not participate in the activities of the forest. However they will consult with its 125 members on ways and times of involvement in the project. It will work on empowering women

Evidence B: The project notes some cultural challenges to incorporation of women in community forest management and protection activities, but proposes a thoughtful approach to supporting women's own reflection, organizing and assumption of more participation and leadership on their own terms and through their own process.

E) Innovation and potential to scale up.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The CIP has taken care of its territory since 1873, it has protected and preserved the forest and cultural practices. It has allies for the development of the proposed activities. In the past he has developed projects with small, medium and large budgets

Evidence B: The project proposes consolidation and enhanced sustainability for a very successful model of indigenous traditional governance, lessons from which are relevant across the region and globe. The scale of this project however is relatively small, and the geographic scope of the proposed biological corridors is not clear.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 30.5/40

Performance of Eol 122 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: The CIP is based in ancestral indigenous territory, has an ancestral system of governance, ensures the collective welfare of their people, cares for and protects its territory holistically. He has extensive experience in the management and conservation of forest and meet the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples

Evidence B: The proposed project has been designed and led by an indigenous community based organization. There is a significant component for organizational strengthening.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The CIP has participated in measurements of water, carbon and biodiversity monitoring. It will have a technical team with expertise in GEF projects, human rights and achieving international financing. The CIP has one or more projects led by Indigenous Peoples. He has several projects with funding from abroad

Evidence B: The fact that El Chilar forest still exists is a testament to the dedicated efforts and leadership of the Poqomam Maya to protect their territory. These types of examples, in which ancestral practices remain vibrant and have been completed with modern scientific management activities, represent an important model for the region and world.

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

3. Does Eol 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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Mentions the Association of Community Forestry Utz Che 'and the Municipality of Talin. Will support the expansion and dissemination of experience

Evidence B: The CIP was one of the founding members of Utz Che, one of the most important networks of community forest associations in Guatemala, and has existing relationships with universities, the local municipality and state agencies for technical support.

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

4. Does Eol 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: Will have a technical team of people participated in GEF projects were not executed by the CIP. CIP's participation in other projects conservation and biodiversity has provided the expertise for implementation of this proposal

Evidence B: While the CIP has not executed GEF projects previously, nor a project of this size, they have managed small and medium sized projects and have retained technical experts with extensive conservation and management experience of GEF 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The CIP uses an annual budget between \$ 10,000 to \$ 100.00 a year. Funding for the organization comes to the less than three sources, but none of them provide more than 60%. The CIP annually produces reports and financial statements. External audits are carried out in response to the request of donors

Evidence B: The project meets all three criteria- they have managed at least one project over \$200k, have at least three funding sources and produce internal audits yearly and external audits on demand. They are however a small organization with reference to the size of their annual budget and the number of projects they have managed.

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: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Dr. Doris Martinez, who will be one of the coordinators of the project itself has GEF projects managed and executed previously (2013), for the National Council Areas Protected as Project Coordinator. He made all administrative and technical tasks required of a coordinator. Mr. Carlos Chex, has been Program Officer in cooperation agencies international and donor countries in Guatemala and Central America also knows the functioning of bilateral and multilateral cooperation mechanisms in the country.

Evidence B: CIP has retained highly qualified management staff with experience of GEF safeguards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/30

Average Total Score: 26/30

Performance of Eol 122 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

