

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 268

Organization: “Organización, Manejo y Conservación” OMYC

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
268	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	22	23	18	63
268	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	20	30	17	67

Performance of Eol 268 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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Area where values converge importance of high biodiversity and cultural richness strategic conservation and sustainable use of ecosystems

Evidence B: part of one of the largest forested area in Mesoamerica

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: Forest under sustainable use, with modest carbon levels

Evidence B: part of one of the largest forested area in Mesoamerica

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: A wide grassroots organization to promote governance, however rights are limited, based forestry concessions

Evidence B: the local organizations have a concession for the management of the area. The concession is coming to an end and needs renewed.

4. Does the proposal explain the unique cultural significance of the area to IPLCs?

Scoring:

- No explanation given of unique significance to IPLCs;
- Significance of site(s) vaguely described;
- Unique significance of project site(s) clearly explained

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

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: participation and importance of IPLC, cultural protection and traditional knowledge and practices evidenced There is limited in the proposal

Evidence B: The community has been in the area for over 100 year; have developed a biodiversity friendly relationship with the land based on ancient Maya culture; depend on the forest for livelihoods and have been managing a unique concession for almost 25 years

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The area is exposed to the pressure change using the ground, which influences the loss of forest mass and biodiversity

Evidence B: Region is threatened with deforestation as a result of agriculture expansion and growing commercial interests in the area.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The legal framework is robust in environmental matters, but limited the rights of IPLC, it should be noted security of tenure from the forms that are in the area and forms of community governance

Evidence B: The communities have a concession that is no directly linked to indigenous rights.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: They have been promoted logging concessions that benefit from community governance, and have promoted a successful community forest management framework.

Evidence B: The program of concesssions as is the case of the OMYC is one such form of support

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Several projects are partnerships between NGOs and IPLC that have developed in the area, have consolidated capacities for sustainable forest management and strengthening collective groups through cooperatives and community partnership for governance.

Evidence B: The certified forest products program and the management of the concession for almost 25 years are good platforms

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: Limited actions are submitted through projects, but the relationship with this proposal is evident.

Evidence B: Two projects are listed; the OMYC has significant partnerships and can also generate some of its own funds.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 268 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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: emphasize efforts to maintain access to natural resources via forest concessions, very little mechanism is seeking to consolidate the substantive rights of the IPLC, it is important to promote sustainability actions and stability of tenure.

Evidence B: It aims to secure the concession beyond the 25 years, strengthen management capacity and livelihood opportunities and get area declared as a community conserved area for protection of Jaguar that might strengthen the communities position

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: How it is possible to improve the practice of community empowerment? from here it should profundisar within a framework of solid governance to improve tenure rights and FPIC of communities in synergy with the framework Legl Guatemalteco, to reduce pressures facing the area by changing soil use

Evidence B: The central action necessary is securing the concession and strengthening the position of the communities.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There is clear intention to maintain a framework of possible access to RR.NN and ecosystem management, is limited as to improve derehos of the IPLC to ensure safeguards against the dynamics and pressures for change of use of soil

Evidence B: The central action necessary is securing the concession and strengthening the position of the communities. the project is addressing this in three ways at least- securing the concession; getting status as a community conserved area for protection of jaguar an building local capacities in biodiversity management linked to livelihoods.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: It could make a greater linkage results with the program objectives and highlight the contributions to the protection of biodiversity, climate resilience and protection of traditional knowledge

Evidence B: The activities proposed do not seem to require huge investments but more could be invested in strengthening the economic initiative of the communities.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There is limited actions in synergy, you can explore other dynamics that occur and occur in the area.

Evidence B: 2 projects listed with some relevance to the project

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Provides for a low impact on spatial scale, it should deepen their level of impact on medium and long term management of larger tracts in the area

Evidence B: from indications in table in question 12

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: There are indicators in production tools and management fairly clear forest ecosystem, social indicators of cultural type associated with biodiversity are not addressed.

Evidence B: livelihood indicators are clear and aligned. Not cultural indicators 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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: A mechanism for organizational sustainability and broad inclusion is necessary to address in this proposal.

Evidence B: If the concession is renewed and area is declared as a community conserved area

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There is a very superficial demonstration of alignment, it is necessary to explore the importance of forest concessions in conservation policies and development of the country and the region in particular and of the project

Evidence B: Estrategias 3, 4 y 5 del Plan de Acción Nacional para la Biodiversidad Biológica

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: There is emphasis on the integration of women in the process, strategy and mechanism and scope of this feature is not explicit

Evidence B: The organisation has experience and offers some concrete approaches

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: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: It requires further as the porceso improve conservation and defense against economic dynamics that threaten ecosystems, likewise the rights of IPLC

Evidence B: the initiative of community managed concessions has the potential of scaling up. It has has been of interest and if continues to be successful will offer excellent lessons.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/40

Average Total Score: 26.5/40

Performance of Eol 268 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 2)



Section 3 - Qualifications and experience of the Organization (Total Points: 30)

A) Indigenous Peoples or Local Community organization legally recognized under national laws.

1. Is the EoI led by an IPLC organization?

Scoring:

- IPLC appear to be beneficiaries only;
- Combination/partnership of IPLC organizations and NGOs, and plans to build IPLC capacity over the project term are clear;
- IPLC-led approach, NGOs in more limited, defined roles (such as fiduciary);
- Fully IPLC composed and led approach

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: It is a joint initiative with support from NGOs to a working group base should deepen a governance framework applied to improve the capabilities of OMYC

Evidence B: OMYC seems to have a long history of work with IPLC

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: there is evidence of leadership, you must highlight the governance model experiences with government systems PLC

Evidence B: OMYC seems to have a long history of work with IPLC and conservation. It won the Equator's prize in 2002.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The proposal is presented pro an initiative of local organizations OMYC, it is clear the integration of local organizations, it will be required to develop a plan of organization and governance to help improve the capacities of local organizations

Evidence B: OMYC seems to have a long history of work with IPLC and conversvation. It won the Equator's prize in 2002.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: There is an organizational level with large growth potential, especially IPLC organizations. Goals will require improved sostenibilidad in this direction for the sustainable management processes RR.NN

Evidence B: The organisations provides a list of adequate personnel and has experience implementing medium size projects

E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the Eol 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: NA/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: It shows a growing organization is identified that requires accompanying both the system of organization, planning and collegial decision-making processes to strengthen a governance framework

Evidence B: The organisations provides a list of adequate personnel and has experience implementing medium size 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: NA/2

Average: 0/2

Evidence A: There's no answer

Evidence B: No

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 17.5/30

Performance of Eol 268 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

