

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 166

Organization: Toledo Institute for Development and Environment (TIDE)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Yolanda Teran	166	Mesoamerica	Belize	30	38	30	98
Jadder Mendoza Lewis	166	Mesoamerica	Belize	22	28	26	76

Performance of Eol 166 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: It is an area rich in animal species, plants, birds, amphibians, mammals and reptiles. It has terrestrial protected areas (40%) and a variety of ecosystems critical for the habitat of vulnerable species and endangered

Evidence B: Área geográfica de alta presencia de bosques en conectividad con la Reserva Maya

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 region has several important areas for biodiversity intact. Forestry is a key factor for climatic change mitigation and adaptation. Declining deforestation, consumption of firewood ± a reduction in the emission of gases.

Evidence B: Bosques con densidad moderada de Carbono, sin embargo muy rica en biodiversidad y expuesta a deforestación.

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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: It is present in the territory indígena Maya with its own governance system. Also live the Garifuna, Mestizos, Creoles, East Indians and Mennonites. Indigenous Peoples is there and local communities

Evidence B: Se reconoce sistemas tradicionales de administración comunal, sin embargo la presión de nuevas formas de poder sobre los recursos que ejercen presión sobre los sistemas tradicionales, es requerido profundizar como el proyecto apoya este sistema tradicional y enfrenta las amenazas de nuevas formas de gobierno sobre los recursos naturales

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: Give a clear explanation of the Maya, their habits, customs, governance systems, use of communal lands presence. Are in a cutting process for recognition and demarcation of their communal lands

Evidence B: Se identifica el papel de los bosques en la cultura Maya, será saludable profundizar como la gobernanza de las comunidades Maya, beneficiarán la conservación, el uso sostenible y el fortalecimiento de las prácticas tradicionales

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: 50% mangrove are lost. Threats by increased frequency and intensity of storms and hurricanes, changes in climate, the natural composition of the soil, aridity, drought, loss of habitats of species, etc.

Evidence B: Es evidente la presión por el cambio de uso del suelo que infiere directamente en la pérdida de bosques y la cultura, amenaza el capital cultural de las comunidades y sus sistemas ancestrales de vida

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: In Belize there is a National Policy on Climático Change Strategy and Plan of Action; National Strategy Plan for Biodiversity and Acción; Strategy for Growth and Sustainable Development; National Plan of Protected Areas System and Policy and Strategy Gestión Forest Fire. La Selva Maya is one of the tropical forests more extensive and rich in biodiversity, but is in danger because of illegal logging, illegal traffic in wildlife, fragmentation of ecosystems, etc.

Evidence B: No son claros los derechos y el marco de gestión inter institucional con estructuras propias comunitarias, hay énfasis de ONG's, se requiere ampliar los derechos y formas de participación de las estructuras tradicionales

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: There are national institutions working on several fronts to avoid deforestation, addressing the Climático change and its consequences. No impact on the organization and management of terrestrial protected areas. The government cre³ a commitment to the rights of the Maya Land in Toledo

Evidence B: Las políticas nacionales reconocen a los actores locales, con limitados derechos de libre determinación, esto es clave en los procesos de gobernanza que se debe impulsar.

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: Cogestión Protected Areas 10 and 50 year ± os Conservation project of biodiversity and improving livelihoods in areas bordering the pine forests of the savanna in Toledo (2019) with the support of several partners including the University of Edinburgh among others

Evidence B: hay evidencia de procesos de desarrollo local claramente gestados, que ayudan y benefician la articulación desde el nivel local.

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: Mentioned three important projects for the ICI proposal concerning protected areas „ forest fire management and protection and land management to avoid the emission of gases. Funding comes from various sources from Germany, the Protected Areas Conservation Trust and The Nature Conservancy.

Evidence B: Hay proyectos planteados, no es evidente la relación fuerte con el proyecto propuesto y su sinergia con el programa


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 30/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 26/30

Performance of Eol 166 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: the proposal has an overall goal, two results, each with specific activities that benefit Indigenous Peoples and local communities. involved. They include the participation of women and child ± os and Nia ± as of the region.

Evidence B: Debe tener una mayor profundidad e incorporar estrategias de consolidar los esfuerzos propios de los IPLC con sus propias herramientas tangibles e intangibles de los conocimientos tradicionales

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Activities and expected outcomes are for short and long term. The result 1 proposes 9 Activities and the result 2 three activities

Evidence B: debe mejorarse la relación con las metas

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The Institute has extensive experience in project management and Geston on bioodversidad, climate change, carbon projects, etc. In addition it works in partnership with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Maya Leaders Alliance is working on rebuilding the Mayan Communities, its economy and Mayan food companies

*Evidence B:*NA

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: They're activities and results clearly defined and explained. Presented details on the distribution of the budget

Evidence B: Bien alineado en términos generales, debe hacerse una mayor especificación de alcances de los objetivos con las acciones previstas

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: They're working on the execution of some relevant projects and support for the proposal. Each member of the consortium will contribute in cash and contributions in kind (human resources, office space, equipment)

Evidence B: Hay proyectos de gran escala que abarcan la zona del proyecto, no se evidencia los vínculos y potenciales sinergias de colaboración mutua

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: You includes indicators on protected areas, land restored and improved practices territories for a total of 504. 785 have

Evidence B: Potencialmente el impacto es mayor a la escala directa, esto debe estimarse para fortalecer la dimension del impacto real de la propuesta

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Additional results include culture, identity (land management), Indigenous Peoples, women and child ± os. Mentions the achievement of disaggregated data, benefits for small businesses, knowledge and management of forest fires, participation in transboundary issues

Evidence B: Es necesario visibilizar los impactos culturales en los sistemas tradicionales sustantivos de la identidad y sistemas de manejo cultural

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Long-lasting benefits are sustained in funding the Government of Belize. The implementation supports various policies and strategies. The creation of the Biodiversity Office also will be of great support in the future. In addition, there is a collaboration of several national institutions.

Evidence B: Hay potenciales impactos a lo largo de toda la propuesta, pero no se presenta un argumento sólido de sostenibilidad, especialmente cultural y económica.

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: EOL is part of the National Strategy and Plan Acción Belize Biodiversity and attention to the objectives B3.6, A4.1, B4.1 and B5.1. The National Biodiversity Plan Belize determines the pressure on biodiversity with changing land use, deforestation, and the expansion of the agricultural frontier, and the effects of climate change.

Evidence B: Hay claridad de las relaciones con las políticas nacionales, esta ausente de particularidades locales ya sean distritos o municipalidades, así mismo de su forma de relación con las instancias nacionales.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: They will be consulted and the women involved in the project. Will receive training on handling fire and equipment for an initiative of women in fire management.

Evidence B: Debe identificarse estrategias de mejorar la participación con enfoque de genero, impulsar los roles de la mujer en la gobernanza

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: It is a well-defined proposal with objectives, activities and achievable and distribution of the budget results. NGO experience, relationships and supports all Andole are favorable points for Eol

Evidence B: Se requiere generar una explicacion holistica del proyecto, que demuestre los impactos culturales básicos de los IPLC como sustento de éxito.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 38/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/40

Average Total Score: 33/40

Performance of Eol 166 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 proposal includes Indigenous Peoples (protected areas in indigenous territories) and local communities in the region. Institute staff has Scholarly © mica formation and extensive experience in the areas of biodiversity, climate change, etc.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: ATs © techniques skills and experience of staff of the institute They're described in point 20. TIDE projects include local stakeholders and the region an attention to emerging needs. References from past projects in execution or show the variety of activities being performed in different regions of Belize

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The implementation for the activities of the contarÃi project with the collaboration of several partner organizations. They're located in different regions

Evidence B: Debe profundizarse el marco de gobernanza desde las estructuras internas comunitarias y proceso de concertaci3n en la gerencia de la iniciativa

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: TIDE has trained personnel in education, tourism, biology, protected areas, administration. It has received funding from the Program Pequea ± as Donations for 15 year ± os, receive a grant from the European Union and BIOMAPA. He is working in different areas and with funding from various organizations

Evidence B: NA

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: TIDE works with an annual budget ranging from 100,000 to a million dollars. Regularly prepares complete financial reports that are delivered on time. In addition they have annual auditorías.

Evidence B: Es una organización en crecimiento, que con el apoyo y asistencia adecuada tiene a consolidarse, debe mapear sus necesidades para fortalecer su liderazgo en procesos de IPLC como estrategia de sostenibilidad

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: TIDE has experience on safeguards and standards required by the GEF through 15 years of his working relationship with SGP, with the execution of the project with the European Union and projects on protected areas among others.

Evidence B: Deben profundizar sus capacidades específicas con políticas de financiamiento del GEF, destacando sus fortalezas actualmente

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 30/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 28/30

Performance of Eol 166 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

