

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 138

Organization: Sotz'il

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Avecita Chicchon	138	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	21	26	26	73
Christopher Jordan	138	Mesoamerica	Guatemala	23	30	27	80

Performance of Eol 138 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The Mesoamerica region considered in this project is highly fragmented. The Key biodiversity areas that exist are in indigenous territories, mainly.

Evidence B: All proposed terrestrial areas are important for biodiversity and include some of the largest core forests for large mammals and threatened species in Mesoamerica. Two of the proposed landscapes are critical intact forests with a significant amount of the region's carbon. The sites are unlikely to have extremely high species endemism, but do include some endemic species of amphibians.

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: According to the map provided, it is moderate.

Evidence B: Certain areas are high carbon value, but I believe that overall the study areas are moderate when the sites in Guatemala are included. The proposed sites in Honduras and Panama are some of the most important forests for carbon 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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: There are 6 areas considered and they are under different regime. The range is from co-management to independent management.

Evidence B: All of the proposed landscapes are managed by IPLC. The proposal includes some areas with extremely strong and active IPLC governance systems (i.e. Gunayala) and other areas that have weak governance and remain untitled (i.e. Tawahka, Honduras). All are within ancestral lands that are titled already or should be titled if they are not yet titled. National governments support for IPLC governance varies considerably between the different sites.

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 document makes it clear that the region has high cultural significance.

Evidence B: The unique cultural significance of the sites are explained; it is clear that the sites are critical to maintaining the transmission of traditional environmental knowledge and that improving management in a way that includes young people is critical to cultural survival and the protection of biodiversity. Nonetheless, the description of how the sites are unique includes few specific and is described in general terms.

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 suffers of high fragmentation and actions for connectivity are needed. This project could fill that void.

Evidence B: The sites included in this proposal are very different, but all have threats. The Honduran Muskitia is perhaps the most threatened forest in Mesoamerica. Guatemala has high rates of deforestation but some programs available to assist with forest management. Gunayala does not suffer from high deforestation rates and has controlled many threats, but has increasing threats to its corals and marine ecosystems, including the islands. Nonetheless Gunayala's system for supporting territorial management will continue to be affected negatively by COVID, so I think in general the threat level can be considered to be high.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There are laws and regulations that are not implemented as they should.

Evidence B: Given that the proposed project is tri-national, this response would ideally vary across countries. Honduras does not have a strong titling law and has not historically respected indigenous rights. It also has high levels of corruption that affect the indigenous territories of the Honduran Muskitia. Guatemala has several useful programs and policy but has not historically been extremely strong in IPLC-led conservation. Nonetheless, the new government has recently started a consultation process that seems promising. Panama is likely the strongest of the three countries in the proposal and the current administration has been extremely friendly to IPLC-led conservation, including approving a resolution to allow titling of indigenous lands in protected areas. The comarca law is very strong. The combination of countries with different levels of enabling policy conditions could be a strength if those lessons learned are shared across countries. In Honduras and Panama, IPLC control over marine resources is limited.

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: There is a legal framework that needs to be improved.

Evidence B: Given that the proposed project is tri-national, this response would ideally vary across countries. Honduras has a titling law, but has not recognized marine territory for IPLCs. Land has been titled, but not respected widely. One main issue has been municipal level government ties to drug trafficking that leads to massive land clearing and other projects (i.e. highways without FPIC). In these cases, the central government is very slow to respond. Guatemala has a varied level of support, with a general lack of willingness to recognize IPLC lands at the national level, and varying results on the ground depending on region. In Panama, the current government is actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation. However the other two countries bring this score down.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: In many of the sub-regions proposed there are good foundations of work that could be scaled up.

Evidence B: In all cases there are well established projects and ally projects not mentioned within the proposal. Gunayala in particular has massive experience with IPLC conservation and management that can be a resource for the other sites.

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: Yes, a few are described in the text.

Evidence B: NA


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 138 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 text is well developed in this regard.

Evidence B: The proposed approach is well aligned and has partners that are able to implement the approach.

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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: There are well articulated set of activities but they need a cohesive theory of change.

Evidence B: The activities and results are well defined in general, but the connection to specific sites is not always clear and there needs to be additional clarity on how the actions will be successfully implemented and how the actions will successfully mitigate external threats.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The scope of the project seems to be broad in 6 regions. It needs to be more focused.

Evidence B: I think the objectives and activities will contribute to the project's context and will help the context if properly fleshed out. I worry that the external threats are not fully taken into account, especially in the Honduran Moskitia. It is necessary to expand on how these threats will be addressed as they are large enough to undermine IPLC governance in this specific area of Honduras. The same is true in Guatemala in the context of multinationals. The challenge with this proposal will be ensuring the results are put into practice and that it will not simply result in pdfs and plans. I think there are enough actions to guarantee that. The one weakness I see is that there are no objectives related to influencing national legislation to improve support for IPLC led conservation.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The proponent argues that the 2M threshold is not enough for this project.

Evidence B: The overall budget is higher than the range of investment.

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: The co-financing projected is basically in-kind.

Evidence B: The overall co-financing is \$800,000 during early years with the potential to be much larger in future years.

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:* 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The Mesomeric region is critical for the region and for the world.

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: 2/3 *Reviewer B:* 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Yes, the project indicates actions that are well articulated in this regard.

Evidence B: The proposal often uses jargon and general language, but the indicators are aligned with the objectives.

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: The long-term sustainability that is offered relies on cultivating the younger generation for the future.

Evidence B: The project is designed to create green economy opportunities for IPLCs that will inevitably need support from allies to a certain extent, but will also create systems that result in long-term sustainability.

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: Yes, they contribute to international, national and local priorities.

Evidence B: The EoI is connected to national priorities and to regional climate commitments.

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: The gender section could be strengthened.

Evidence B: Gender is considered throughout the proposal.

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: 3/5 *Reviewer B:* 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: There are several organizations involved in the project and they have different degree of expertise. The proponent organization seems to be creative and has demonstrated that it is able to deliver positive impact.

Evidence B: The proposal will build foundational documents like management plans that inform conservation moving forward, will have models and indicators for inter-generational exchange, will establish IPLC led marine conservation areas, and more. A lot of these have the potential for scaling up if done with that in mind.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/40

Average Total Score: 28/40

Performance of Eol 138 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: Sotz'il is an indigenous organization and all the partner organizations are indigenous, too. It is clear that they had a participatory process to develop this project.

Evidence B: The proposal is a collaboration between six indigenous NGOs.

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: Yes, there is evidence of grassroots leadership.

Evidence B: While the organizations vary in their stability and impact, overall they have very substantial experience and have demonstrated leadership over time. In some areas the leadership is exceptional, in others it is slightly less. Overall it is a very good partnership.

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: High marks in this regard as stated in the text.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Proponent has GEF experience.

*Evidence B:*As a team they have full capacity and GEF project experience, though I do not believe that each individual organizations has GEF experience.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: There is evidence, but this has to be assessed more in depth.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: Yes, the proponent organization states that it has experience.

*Evidence B:*NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/30

Average Total Score: 26.5/30

Performance of Eol 138 in Mesoamerica - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

