

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 181

Organization: Asociación de Forestería Comunitaria de Guatemala Utz' Ché

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Paulo Celso de Oliveira	181	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	23	24	28	75
Filiberto Penados	181	Mesoamerica		18	17	18	53

Performance of Eol 181 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: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The set of indigenous territories that are part of this proposal are relevant to the protection of biological diversity.

Evidence B: The region is an important area for biodiversity and within that indigenous territories

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: Area of high tonne of carbon in soil and biomass.

Evidence B: The region is an important area for biodiversity and within that indigenous territories

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The proponente partners and indigenous organizations perform their own territorial agendas and participate fully in decision-making related to economic, cultural and social affairs, also acting on issues related to biodiversity conservation.

Evidence B: There are 6 participating countries with differing realities.

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: The applicant lists the territory with economic, social and cultural issues, but does not provide details.

Evidence B: there are 6 different areas, some explanation is provided.

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Loss and fragmentation of habitats Example invasion of indigenous lands by non-indigenous people to settle in these lands to explore agriculture, hunting and illegal logging (GunaPanama), mechanized rice planting and cutting of natural wood (Embera, Panama), pressure by armed groups and groups funded by fazendeiros causing murder and forced removal of (Miskitos and Mayangnas, Nicaragua) groups of loggers, narco farmers entrepreneurs pushing pressure to the oil palm plantation (Meskito, Honduras), pressure against associations of indigenous leaders (Costa Rica) and loss of biodiversity due to the advance of farming (Mexico)

predatory fish fishing, lobsters in the territories of indigenous peoples located in the countries mentioned above ..

Evidence B: In general the areas have medium to high levels of threat.

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 applicant and its partner organizations have experience in carrying out activities in indigenous territories. So there are conditions.

Evidence B: The reality varies per country but in general there is a tendency to support IPLC led conservation

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: Guatemala La Estrategia Nacional de Diversidad Biológica y su Plan de Acción 2012 - 2022, el desarrollo de las condiciones políticas, legales, sociales, financieras.

In Nicaragua the National government is promoting the implementation of REDD+ on indigenous territories. In Honduras, national policies promote the conservation of these large ecosystems of Mosquitia. In Panama since 1994, the Ministry of the Environment approved and recognized the Area Silvestre Corregimiento Protected Natural Area of 100,000 has. In Panama, the Ministry of Regional Directorate of Environment in Gunayala, which coordinates various activities and strategies with the Congreso

General Guna was established. Panama aprobó la National Climate Change Policy (ANAM, 2007). Mexico: Mexico approved the National Strategy on Biodiversity of Mexico (ENBioMex) the y Acción Plan from 2016 to 2030 .. Costa Rica is internationally renowned for its success in conservation.

Evidence B: the support varies across the region.

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:* 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The initiatives of proponent and partner follow principles organizations that make up a collective management of natural resources, valorizing full forests integrally and its multiple use, the direct participation of dentetores, sustainability and accountability, thus developed DIVERSAM defense projects and monitoring of indigenous lands, biodiversity conservation, sustainability of indigenous communities.

Evidence B: Varies across the region

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:* NA/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Outside presented ÖSTROS projects in the areas of reforestation, protection of tararugas, promote the participation of women and youth in the territorial recuperation processes between wrapping other. However it was not present more detailed information to enable understanding the impact of these projects.

Evidence B: A number of projects are listed but not all active in all the areas. it is hard to assess


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 20.5/30

Performance of Eol 181 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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposal seeks to strengthen governança and proteção of territories and natural resources, strengthen a conservação environment and strengthen the financial capacity of women and local communities in biodiversity management.

Evidence B: The approach is well aligned in a general sense but different components are being implemented in different areas.

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: NA/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The planned activities are relevant to alcançar results. Only it would be important to clarify what will be the local communities will be set to participar project.

Evidence B: different components are being implemented in different areas it lacks clarity and cohesion

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The project will provide the implementation of major activities to protect indigenous land rights and environmental conservation.

Evidence B: The objectives are ok but the the activities are dispersed and seem to lack cohesion

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The activities and results are in line with the range of investments and the work plan may be designed appropriately to the budget.

Evidence B: hard to assess

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Were apresetads sources cofinanciaenamento to present details of the impacts.

Evidence B: hard to assess

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Total area of improved management: 3.85 million ha. The total area is significant and includes indigenous territories of people located in different countries of Mesoamerica.

Evidence B: from table provided yes it would be high

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: It refers to protection of sacred sites and enhancement of the participation of indigenous women in organizational processes PCLI for biodiversity conservation, culture and lengua

Evidence B: hard to assess

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The applicant makes reference to the approach to sustainability and increasing the capacity of communities to maintain governance of the territory and the preservation of the environment.

Evidence B: too dispersed over the region and lack of cohesive strategy

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: The proposal was drawn up on the conscience of vision and enhancement of biological diversity and ancestral knowledge and articulates with the strategies, programs and policies national públicas of each country of the region.

Evidence B: The individual components are aligned

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Utz'Ché promotes the participation of women in the different spaces of dialogue, making design and development of capacitates.

Evidence B: the project is being implemented in different areas but the strategy seems to focus on proponent organizations

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: 1/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Activities are important for conservation. Also acting together various indigenous organizations from different countries of Meso America can serve as a strategy to strengthen indigenous organizations in the region.

Evidence B: hard to assess


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/40

Average Total Score: 20.5/40

Performance of Eol 181 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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: Claramento is shown that approach is led by an indigenous organization

Evidence B: two of the proposing organizations are coordinating IPLC and all the associates too

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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The fact that the formation proponente have partnership with several grassroots organizations demonstrates its leadership in the field.

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: 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Yes, this demonstrated. Partnering with other organizations is an important factor of the proposal.

Evidence B: the proposing organizations and associates seem to have a long history

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The applicant already has experience with the management and implementation of projects and formed a partnership with ICCO, an organization with important administrative experience.

Evidence B: The capacity seems to be there

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The organization has experience with project management above \$ 200,000, is due accountability and auditing.

Evidence B: Similar large projects seem to have been executed before

6. Does lead organization have experience with safeguards and other standards required by GEF?

Scoring:

- Answered no;
- Answered yes but with weak or lacking explanation to the extent;
- Answered yes with clear explanation of the extent

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

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: He replied that possi experientia with the GEF, but did not explain what was the experience of thymus.

Evidence B: No

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 181 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

