

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 341

Organization: Asociación Boliviana para la Investigación y Conservación de Ecosistema Andino-Amazónicos (ACEAA)

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
341	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	23	34	23	80
341	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	17	27	19	63

Performance of Eol 341 in Andes/Amazon - 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: The Amazon rainforest covers 10% of biodiversity, there are several plant species, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, etc. Amazonia contains millions of tons methods © tricas carbon and is a center with great cultural diversity

Evidence B: The area has a good level of conservation and is representative of the Bolivian Amazon, being in the zone of influence of booking Madidin and areas near Lake Rogaguado, key areas of biodiversity conservation. The proposal also details the importance of these areas and the Amazon in general, although under specific action is somewhat limited compared to global impacts, their actions in local terms would be key

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: Carbon storage in forest amazÃ³nico (between 90 and 140 million tons methods © tricas) is critical to the mitigation of the climÃ¡tico regulation and climate change. It will be necessary the creation of strategies and mechanisms for territorial GestiÃ³n and adapting to the change climÃ¡tico

Evidence B: Moderate carbon stocks unrecoverable 50t / ha. The proposal shows an overview of the ecological function of the area against climate regulation and its importance against carbon

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 indigenous communities are involved in GestiÃ³n and management of the area through community governance systems the same. Titration there are problems of land

Evidence B: Two of the three territories are represented entirely by autonomous governance of indigenous peoples, however Tacana II is not legally entitled to the community, so they constantly face invaciones in their territories. Added to this there are serious problems of organizational capacity and management

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: It is an area rich in biodiversity, carbon in various cultures indigenous. Indigenous Peoples are the custodians of the conservation of forests essential for life and survival of Peoples

Evidence B: Only the explanation of one of the sites is given, highlighting the importance of protecting and harboring last families of Yaminahua peoples and Machineri in the country. But the cultural significance of others is explained vaguely.

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: Forest coverage is lost by habilitaci3n of land for agricultural, mining, new roads, illegal logging. There are changes in land use. In addition there are variations in rainfall patterns causing problems to the local economy of Indigenous Peoples

Evidence B: The major threats that arise are medium impact, there is no strong threats by processes or processes intensive infrastructure development projects are menders, among others. Adding to this one area, presents constant invanci3n of peasants, for their non-qualification. However the area no strong threats that are in line with the level of conservation presented by this 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: In Bolivia there is the Law 071 on the Rights of Mother Earth and the Law 300 of Mother Earth and Integral Development for Living Well. the Integral and Sustainable Gesti3n of the forest is promoted. The implementation of these laws and will lead GISB time due to the current policy situation of Bolivia

Evidence B: Although Bolivia is ampliamente recognized as a multiethnic state and have a legal framework against the IPLC, currently the government is in a transition process until there are new elections, so there is a gap against the political will of the new government it should be positioned to August this year. However Bolivia stands out for its policy associated with the rights of Mother Earth, which favore the aplicaci3n strategies and models of local conservation management

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: Bolivia recognizes land ownership by Indigenous Peoples with four modes. The interim government is not favorable to the rights of Indigenous Peoples

Evidence B: There is uncertainty about the political will of the new government, however it is recognized for several years the active participation of IPLC in making local and regional decisions, however the Amazonian nationalities continue to identify more gaps that Andean associated with braces government in terms of conservation. The proposed some key policy frameworks for the management outlines, but no specific active actions mentioned in the government cut that can serve as support for this proposal.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There conservation and community projects that are in execution until the year 2021 with funding ± or different. The lines of action are on the management of non-timber resources, protected areas and sustainable strengthening productive capacities

Evidence B: There are projects that have been applied in these TCO, some actions are named in the proposal. But it is known from associated sources, funding associated with conservation agreements, regional projects among others.

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: 0/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The draft Euroclima and the European Union related to Climático Change. Capacity building of territorial Indigenous Peoples Gestión Bolivianos (Conservation International)

Evidence B: There are potential opportunities, but no clear synergies identified projects and / or actors that can support explicitly.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 341 in Andes/Amazon - 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: It has goals, objectives and clear proposals in line with the objectives of the ICI. For example increased capabilities in managing and Gestión programs, strengthen the comprehensive management of forests and the development of pilot projects. These activities tend to have an impact on the strengthening and consolidation of governance and Indigenous Peoples in the embodiment of efforts for education, culture and natural resources

Evidence B: The proposal has a direct approach to management of indigenous lands, with actions of capacity building and sustainable use pilots, however the overall benefits of these areas are not clearly exposed

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: The three main objectives. They're mentioned the results clearly. However it fell short indicate the activity schedule or time embodiment of efforts to achieve these results.

Evidence B: Objectives, actions and results clearly defined and explained.

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: Embodiment of the project will contribute positively to Indigenous Peoples. Tendra's ATs tools & social techniques for the management and direction of sustainable projects. the empowerment of indigenous women (cultural theme complex) was achieved

Evidence B: clear, but very low contributions in relation to the actions that can be developed in these sectors, as well as the sum of other possible TCO to articulate in the project

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Activities and results are well aligned with the rank of investment EOL. A balanced distribution of the amount allocated along with a definite timetable ayudar in the embodiment of activities / results

Evidence B: Well aligned regarding the budget and activities demarcated

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: 0/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: ACEAA as part of a consortium HATH NICFI applying for funds from NORAD. Conservation International Fund for the Peoples of the Amazon (Leticia Pact)

Evidence B: Sources of financing lacks clear, there are potential sources and partners, but it is unclear whether they can be implemented within the framework of this proposal

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: 307,675 hectares of terrestrial protected areas for the conservation and sustainable use 307,675 hectares of land restored 215,000 hectares of land with improved practices

Evidence B: 370.675 ha that may be impacted by the actions of this project, however the TCO Tacana II not being lawfully entering your area may vary constituted direct implementation.

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: Mentioned number of beneficiaries administrative capacities strengthened, beneficiaries using better biosecurity measures. Beneficiaries participating in new ventures and number of families dependent on improved management of natural resources

Evidence B: In cultural terms there is no greater direct impact as expressed in the proposal on the table in question 13, but so indirectly if it could generate more aligned cultural indicators, associated to one of the TCO are the last representatives of an indigenous people. In terms of livelihoods strengthened if present indicators.

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: AyudarÃn strengthened capabilities to generate conservation impacts medium- and long-term vision according to the development of Indigenous Peoples. RealizarÃn new ventures are sustainable natural resource management linked to conservation

Evidence B: The project presents a vision of long-term sustainability based on the self-sustaining processes by the communities, however this does not guarantee long-term sustainability because it is not aligned to other sources of financing, public policies sub-cutting or other complementary strategies

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: Forests help in the mitigation of the climÃtico change and adaptation to it, contributes to food security, poverty reduction, etc. The proposal articulates with the instruments of planning local, national, regional and international levels through the Nationally Determined contribution that responds to the Aichi Targets and commitments of Rio + 20

Evidence B: Contributes as it is specifically forest management

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: It recognizes the importance of the role of women, strengthening their capacities to ensure their participation in all levels of decision processes territorial GestiÃ³n. The capacitaciÃ³n will be on management and GestiÃ³n of productive enterprises and natural resource management

Evidence B: The project is focused on strengthening capacities of associations / groups of women

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: There are good conservation territory under the governance indÃgena but their culture and habitat is threatened by the migration of young people to the city. There are territories without favoring invasions Titration for excessive logging of forests. There is aware of these problems on forests and culture, so the proposed project activities and results to solve these problems. Land tenure is key to food security and sovereignty during and after © s of the pandemic, as well as the contribution made visible women in all instances

Evidence B: The project is articulado some exercises performed in the area of forest management, the fact of incorporating women as the linchpin in patterns of use makes innovative, yet missing more elements in the activities and implementations to be able thinking processes scales


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 34/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/40

Average Total Score: 30.5/40

Performance of Eol 341 in Andes/Amazon - 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 0/6

Average: 1/6

Evidence A: ACEAA is an NGO created in 2012 indígena not working on strategies for conservation of biodiversity in the Andean region of Bolivia-Amazónica. It works directly with local indigenous communities to conserve the Amazon forests through training and strengthening of organizations.

Evidence B: Only beneficiaries, IP are not clearly articulated but appears to go from being beneficiaries to be implementors

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: ACEAA has appyado in the improvement and conservation areas and mediane sibnacionales prptegodas ancionales technique, supplies and support equipment Working with Indigenous Peoples in the management of natural resources and wildlife monitoring at Community level, Capacitaci3n and workshops offered through © s of a multidisciplinary team

Evidence B: Since 2012 are an organization with multiple processes with indigenous peoples and have helped strengthen the Bolivian Amazon territory, with research processes, actions governance among others

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: It mentions an organization that would provide capacitación in leadership indígena. Two additional organizations as beneficiaries of the project

Evidence B: Three Indian organizations are associated, two as direct beneficiaries and another as part of the training process, however do not appear with other roles for autonomous implementation, as well as links with national indigenous organizations and other representative level

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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The organization is implementing some projects climático change, protected areas and capacity building. It has international allies working for the Peoples of the Amazon and have experience working with Indigenous Peoples. Muotidisplibario his team on issues of biodiversidad, conservation, life plans, etc. It is a positive contribution to the project.

Evidence B: They have experience, leadership and processes have carried out show concrete results. Although they have not handled the GEF resources have other processes in the past with international organizations

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: An annual budget between 100,000 to 1 million dollars Produce reports and financial statements on a regular basis

Evidence B: Demonstrates ability good administrative and operational capacity

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: In the past the organization has worked for proposals for the GEF. He has experience in managing funds and bilateral cooperation projects using World Bank safeguards related to Indigenous Peoples

Evidence B: said yes with a clear explanation of the projects that have been involved the use of these standards

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 341 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

