

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 397

Organization: Instituto para el Futuro Común Amerindio

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
397	Mesoamerica	Honduras	23	31	16	70
397	Mesoamerica		15	12	12	39

Performance of Eol 397 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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Area forest-largest in Mesoamerica, and connected two strategic biosphere reserves in the region.

Evidence B: The area is at the heart of the CBM in Honduras and is part of a KBA

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The level of carbon density, according to the map is less than 100t / ha, however the diversity of ecosystems and landscape approach makes high-value forests of the humid tropics.

Evidence B: part of a territory with 50-100t/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: There is progress nouns in designing models of community governments to Tarves territorial figures in recent years in Honduras, it is necessary that management mechanisms Biosphere Reserve Rio Platano models of governance chords boost to self-determination IPLC.

Evidence B: While there are some areas under IPLC governance the Eol does not provide information on this

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: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Very poor addressing the cultural value of the area proposed in the project, you can delve into the diversity of indigenous peoples converge.

Evidence B: the proposal only offers some general notes on its significance

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: There are efforts to curb deforestation as the main cause of loss of ecosystems, however there are gaps in the dynamics of governance to be improved, to ensure control and territorial domination and sustainable management of key resources biodiversity

Evidence B: Indigenous lands in general are under threat in Honduras as a result of cumulative development pressures. In this area it may not be as high. Forest cover change and fragmentation seem to be a significant threat. This is not well articulated in the EoI

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The process of community empowerment and governance systems are weak and should continue to strengthen deepened models territoriality and rights of use and conservation of biodiversity.

Evidence B: While some rights are recognized and there are state plans these seem to be weak and lack implementation

7. Is there active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed country/area?

Scoring:

- National or sub-national governments are actively opposed to IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have recognized the importance of IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments are actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: novel process are recognized and unprecedented in Honduras policy, it must be further and defining a frame of reference standards IPLCs policies.

Evidence B: There is some recognition of IPLC-led conservation but these seems to be as a result of continuous indigenous pressure. It is indicated that there some government initiatives but it is not elaborated on how it supports IPLC.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: You have several management processes, the scale of time and resources are key to overcoming pilots processes.

Evidence B: IPs have been very active in defending their rights and lands and these certainly serve as a foundation, It is not clear that there have been IPLC-led conservation initiatives however.

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: Cooperation Process EU and German cooperation. are key to achieving sustainability of the proposal should indetificarse in partnership framework.

Evidence B: There seem to be projects but they dont seem to be in the direct proposed geographic area.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 15/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 397 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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: clear effort will emphasize reducing deforestation, to a lesser extent the development and strengthening of livelihoods and governance is addressed. Shares on the other hand are more emphatic in means of production.

Evidence B: The idea of planes territoriales/planes de vida makes good sense as it can be a central strategy for stewardship; the investment in sustainable agriculture which contributes to improved livelihood does too. Placing them at the center of the strategy is critical. It is not clear how the increased state presence is strategically connected - at the moment it focuses on conservation and less on livelihoods. There is no indicator for improved livelihoods.

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 important to strengthen actions leading to the protection of forests, systems organization and articulation of the various levels of government that affect forest dynamics.

Evidence B: The strategy seems to be: IPs have a territorial plan which will strengthen stewardship. and state presence will be increased. It is not clear how these connect? There are a number of exchanges but it is not clear how strategic these are in relation to the goals of the project

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: ambitious challenges, which meet the goals of the program.

Evidence B: The increased state presence can mean protection of PAs from outsiders. Cacao farming can mean increased livelihoods and reduction of pressure; territorial plans can mean a plan for stewardship and improved livelihoods. These need to be better connected however and the other activities better aligned with the overall strategy

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Very clearly aligned production approach, to a lesser extent forest governance and management of governance of indigenous territories.

Evidence B: NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;

- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Key efforts in the region of the project.

Evidence B: some reference is made to projects but these seem to be marginal

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: A 1M projection has directly with potential externalities headspace.

Evidence B: NA

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: NA/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: It requires indicators emphasize qualitative and quantitative achieve in the project.

Evidence B: While there is discussion of livelihoods and the importance of culture and cosmovision, no indicators were really provided

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The lack of depth in the systems of self-government of communities for the defense and management of territories, can not estimate an effective range of post project sustainability and wing solutions pressures of deforestation in the long run.

Evidence B: The theory of change seems to be: greater capacities for IP stewardship plus improved livelihoods and greater state presence will result in greater conservation and livelihoods. A vision for long term sustainability of the impact of the project is not well articulated

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: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Correspondence with formal policies on clear.

Evidence B: there is a narrative on CBD, resilience, COP and CCAD that hint at the contributions but these are not clearly articulated

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The approach and gender approach this level statement and specific actions, it is necessary to pay a culture of gender equity for effective sustainable development and safeguarding the protection of biodiversity.

Evidence B: there is a discussion of the importance of gender mainstreaming but the discussion what the project will actually do is limited indicating it is not thought through yet

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: 1/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: It is a key area of world attention and vulnerable area to climate change.

Evidence B: The project has potential if centered around territorial plans and greater state collaboration (not only presence) that goes beyond strict conservation. That is how will state presence relate to territorial plan implementations.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 31/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 12/40

Average Total Score: 21.5/40

Performance of Eol 397 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: NA/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The organization filing is made up of IPLC, however it is NGOs character.

Evidence B: Though it is indicated that there are indigenous professionals, I don't get the sense that the project involves IPs beyond beneficiaries

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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: encouraging background are presented, is an organization re-founding by their leaders, who has a high historical presence in the dynamics of IPLC in the project.

Evidence B: The organisation seems to have several projects involving or collaborating with indigenous peoples

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

3. Does EoI demonstrate that the lead proponent has strong partnerships, particularly with other IPLC organizations, to carry out the work?

Scoring:

- No partners defined;
- No IPLC partners identified;
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners but without clear scope (roles in project design or governance);
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners with clear roles (in project design or governance);
- Strong IPLC partnerships that play a central role in design, governance, and implementation of the project;
- Strong IPLC partnerships have a central role in design, governance and implementation of the project and linkages with national or regional IPO networks

Reviewer A: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: 0

*Evidence B:*The projects do not specify roles.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The organization requires support institutional strengthening to ensure plans, monitoring and sustainability of processes evergadura of the proposed project.

*Evidence B:*The organization indicates they have a full team of professionals in a relevant fields

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: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: It requires support assistance and skills transfer.

Evidence B: The implemented projects have been small in comparison

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: NA/2

Average: 0/2

Evidence A: Not

Evidence B: none indicated

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 12/30

Average Total Score: 14/30

Performance of Eol 397 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

