

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 299

Organization: Resguardo Kogui Malayo Arhuaco - Pueblo Kogui

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
299	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	30	38	27	95
299	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	22	26	22	70
299	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	20	27	22	69

Performance of Eol 299 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5 Reviewer C: 5/5*

**Average: 4.67/5**

*Evidence A:* Colombia is a mega-diverse country, which is 10% of the world's biodiversity. It is a mixture of ecological systems, and biological climatic

*Evidence B:* The project presented reflects importance of the landscape / seascape / indigenous territory for biodiversity and for indigenous peoples, with additional consideration to climate benefits. For example, the area of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta extends from a sea level up to 5775 m above sea level, and has a high variety of climates and ecosystems.

*Evidence C:* Region with different ecosystems.

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 Reviewer C: 1/2*

**Average: 1.67/2**

*Evidence A:* It has a variety of ecosystems terrestrial and coastal marine ecosystems. It has key areas for the conservation of biodiversity

*Evidence B:* The paper demonstrates with its map, the area proposed covers approximately 120,000 hectares which mainly covers terrestrial, and a strip of coastal marine ecosystems between the Rancheria River to the Rio Ancho very important for mitigating climate.

*Evidence C:* Region contains thousands of tons of carbon in soil and biomass.

## 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 Reviewer C: 1/2*

**Average: 4.67/5**

*Evidence A:* In Ezwamas (own policy division of the ancestral territory) self-government is exercised and traditional knowledge is preserved. Born beyond the principles governing the government of spaces, biodiversity and knowledge. They have regained governance of the territory and recognition of sacred sites 346

*Evidence B:* The proposed project expresses that governance established from the outset, the Ezwamas play a major role. These are places where self-government is exercised and all the ancestral knowledge of the Sierra is preserved in its territorial jurisdiction. However, there is some limitation to apply their fundamental rights in the proposed area.

*Evidence C:* Governance exercised by the four people indigeans inhabiting the territory.

### 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 Reviewer C: NA/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* The Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, SNSM by the Law of Origin is the ancestral territory of the Kogi, Wiwa, Arhuaco Kankuamo and villages. This comprises nine levels, four above and four below, the Kogi live on the fifth level and takes care of four major Ezwamas, Guamaka, Makotama, Suribaka and Jukumiezhi. Each village is custodian of its territory and its holy sites, its natural and cultural maintenance and functionality

*Evidence B:* The document clearly explains their unique relationship cons lands, territories and resources. For example, the territory has thousands of places specific -known as all sacred sites located on hills, valleys, rocks, and water bodies (including the sea) from which the balance and health of absolutely everything remains. These sacred sites have a very close relationship with ecosystems and species that surround them, being key natural and cultural maintenance to ensure its functionality.

*Evidence C:* NA

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: 4/5 Reviewer C: 3/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* Colonization processes affect the territory of the Kogi people. The ancestral territory that is out of the Resguardo to the sea, HATH occupied by non-indigenous dedicated to industrial megaprojects, infrastructure, energy and tourism © ticos. The deforestation and timber extraction, the construction of docks, marine pollution, etc. are activities that lead to a high degree of transformation and vulnerability. Ecosystems of the lower part of the SNSM They're highly threatened and degraded.

*Evidence B:* The area is vulnerable to negative current threats and risks for indigenous peoples and biodiversity without proper action. For example, the marine-coastal strip of this region is under strong pressure and threats because it has poor reality of planning the territory, and use and management of natural resources. Deforestation and logging of mangroves and coastal wetlands, removal of debris and sand reefs, and the construction of piers and spurs have diminished the resilience of ecosystems to coastal storms, floods and extreme events.

*Evidence C:* Pressure on terrestrial and marine ecosystem. Devastation and logging in mangrove swamps and coastal humidities. Activities of economic and social development developed upstream impact the communities seencontram the course of the river.

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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* Kogi people to being the eldest sons of the Mother are the Guardians of Nature in I SNSM space that has national and international protection (Biosphere Reserve and Natural Heritage of Humanity). There are several national decisions that support the work and mission of the People Kogui and Ezwamas (recognition of limits, land use defined by Indigenous Peoples, recognition of ancestral knowledge, as well declarations of interest © s Cultural Jaba Taniwashkaka)

*Evidence B:* The area allows favorable political conditions, some positive government support and presence of successful conservation initiatives led by indigenous peoples could be expanded. However, there are limitations to the application of their rights.

*Evidence C:* The organization has made efforts to recover the lower region of the territory and has also made efforts to preserve sacred sites.

## 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 Reviewer C: NA/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Several administrative arrangements made by the Indigenous Peoples. Agreements to ensure the permanence of ecosystems and cultural values in the territory. Example 191 the Resolution 1964, the Resolution 0002 1973 2873 Resolution of 2012, Resolution 3760 2017 1500 2018 decree

*Evidence B:* According to the document submitted by the interested parties, there is some government support for conservation led by indigenous peoples in the country / area proposed

*Evidence C:* Historiamente the government has been active in conservation of ecosystems by creating conservation units co example NNP Sierra Nevada. Ministerio the performance of Culra in protecting the holy sites.

## 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: 1/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* Worked on The implementation of protected areas in the PNSNSM, Parque Nacional Tayrona, Salamanca Island Road Park, Wildlife Sanctuary (SFF) cia © naga Grande de Santa Marta and SFF los Flamencos They achieved the demarcation of the line Black to delimit the ancestral territory indÁgena, the agreement between the Territorial Board of Governors Indigenous

Councils of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, etc.

*Evidence B:* The proposed project demonstrates, there are successful conservation initiatives led by indigenous peoples in the area proposed to provide a basis to expand by biological, ecosystem and cultural particularity of the biogeographical district Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, there have been conservation efforts through implementation of important protected areas such as PNN Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta and Tayrona NNP, Salamanca Island Road Park, Wildlife Sanctuary (SFF) Ciénaga Grande de Santa Marta and SFF Los Flamencos.

*Evidence C:* The protection of sacred sites can serve as a strategy for the protection of territorial heritage, environmental and cultural of these indigenous peoples.

### 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 Reviewer C: 1/3*

**Average: 1.33/2**

*Evidence A:* They are developing several complementary activities that are in line with the EOL. The OGT is working on several different proposals and projects to secure financing and maintenance of the activities of the shelter. CAT Pro works with Colombia in the conservation of the environment. There are agreements with The Amazon Conservation Team since 2012.

*Evidence B:* Other initiatives (major projects) that provide additional support for conservation led by indigenous peoples in geography. However, no specific details about the timing and amount of investment on the proposed project.

*Evidence C:* Convenios to expand the Sierra Nevada Santa Marta National Park with Kogui people and management activities Management, restoration and conservation of sacred sites with cultural and environmental role.

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 30/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 299 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 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* It is a proposal for recovery of ancestral lands through a series of strategic lines of action, specific and clearly defined activities. Contributing to results achieved to improve human rights, PICL and governance of natural resources, improve the management of natural and cultural resources, address the causes of environmental degradation, conservation directed and sustained by PICL.

*Evidence B:* The proposed approach and ability to support traditional structures, knowledge and community practices in delivering global environmental benefits are well aligned.

*Evidence C:* It is a Volada proposal for the recovery of indigenous territory, setting up procedures for shared management, protection of sacred sites and the environment.

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: 4/6 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 4.67/6**

*Evidence A:* The proposal of the People Kogi has two long-term goals: recovery of the ancestral territory (possession and generation of conservation processes) and recovery and protection of sacred sites in the Black Lands and areas affected by it. It has three lines strategically specific: the line 1 has 7 activities, the line 2 with five activities and line 3 with 6 activities.

*Evidence B:* The proposed document presents activities and results but clear and compelling need to clarify the context and the time period



*Evidence C:*The proposal introduces the concepts for the performance, but lacking better define the activities,

### 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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* Kogi people economic partner knows the threats that the indigenous peoples and the environment. They're sure of their cultural role and want to get with this project which have experienced politician lobby, creation of protected areas, co-PA governance with the state, etc.

*Evidence B:*The project will help identify threats and opportunities for conservation allow led by indigenous peoples. For example, strengthening governance processes and management of the territory will allow opportunities to identify threats.

*Evidence C:*The proposal could contribute significantly to strengthen Governance and incidence of indigenous peoples in the protection of sites and environmental sabrados conservação.

### 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 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.67/3**

*Evidence A:* Objectives and achievements are clear and possible to be made in five year ± os and the budget. the Organization manages an annual budget of \$ 800,000

*Evidence B:*According to the proposed project presented, the activities can be achieved within a budget range of \$ 500,000 to \$ 2,000,000 USD over a period of 5 years of implementation of the project

*Evidence C:*The proposal is aligned with the activities and results.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The organization is part of several projects in the region related to censuses, agreements and management activities, restoration and conservation of sacred sites, etc. Is advancing proposals on environmental and conservation of ancestral territory, food sovereignty, sustainable production and consolidation of self-government. No work and experience at national and international level. IMPORTANT UNDERSTANDING AUTOGESTIĂ "OF THE PEOPLE KOGUI for funding and support of the proposal

*Evidence B:* The document includes moderate and specific sources of co-funding. However, it does not detail the period of time or context thereof

*Evidence C:* specific initiatives were presented that can collaborate with the project.

## B) Potential of the proposed activities to achieve IPLC-led transformational impact that generate global environmental benefits.

### 6. Are the estimated Global Environmental Benefits (GEF core indicators) substantial and realistic?

Scoring:

- Not provided;
- Very Low (below 10,000 Ha);
- Moderate (between 100,000 - 500,000 Ha);
- High (between 500,000 - 1,000,000 Ha);
- Very high above 1,000,000 Ha

*Reviewer A: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5 Reviewer C: 2/5*

**Average: 2.67/5**

*Evidence A:* If you meet the basic indicators of the GEF in a realistic manner. They will benefit 855 rural families and indigenous

*Evidence B:* Regarding the document, the estimated global environmental benefits (basic indicators of the GEF) is moderate

*Evidence C:* No known total area under the improved management.

### 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 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.67/3**

*Evidence A:* Propose additional cultural indicators concerning governance, governance of land, territory management, cultural restoration and restoration ecológica. Are inter related indicators at all times.

*Evidence B:* The proposed project shows that the proposed indicators are clearly derived from the objectives of the project. For example, territorial governance, land management, community welfare and others.

*Evidence C:* Presents cultural indicators that can you contribute to the project. Note that the recognition of sacred sites is important for the recovery of territories and environmental conservation.

## 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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* The territory is a fundamental element for the development of cultural diversity of Indigenous Peoples. The People Kogi has extensive experience working with traditional knowledge, recovery and care of sacred sites and has a global responsibility as Guardian of Mother Nature. Values, mandates and principles based on its cosmovisión Law and Mayor of Origin They will be the key drivers to continue working permanently in the recovery and reconstruction of their ancestral territory. The pandemic has left us great lessons of life and projects like this are key to the spiritual sustenance of PICL, humanity and Mother Earth.

*Evidence B:* This project will ensure medium-term benefits for biodiversity and governance systems of indigenous peoples but it is expected that future funding based on this initiative for a long-term benefit

*Evidence C:* The applicant considers that the project strengthens the capacity of Kogui people, creating conditions for long-term management of sustentabilidad.

## 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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

### **Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* HATH proposal framed in national strategies such as the Strategy and Plan of Action on Biodiversity, the National Biodiversity Policy, Law 99 of 1993 and the Political Constitution. Furthermore it goes online with the article 8j and 10c of the Convention of Biological Diversity

*Evidence B:* The document is based and contributes to some national priorities as defined in NBSAP but does not indicate the priorities of the NDCs.

*Evidence C:* The proposal is in line with the National Policy for Biodiversity Comprehensive Management and its ecosystem services and its Action Plan (MADS).

## 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 Reviewer C: 2/3*

### **Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* Within the People Kogi man (Sun), Mamo and women (Luna), Saka are interdependent and complementary. The elements of Mother Earth has male and female elements. They will be the women involved in the project actively and effectively by strengthening their roles exercised in the community

*Evidence B:* The document shows that the feminine and masculine qualities are interdependent and complementary.

*Evidence C:* In view Kaguias qualities female and male are complementary. So there will be support for women's participation in project activities.

## 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: 3/5 Reviewer C: 4/5*

## **Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* Activities and results point to the obtaining of innovative and transformative achievements. Trying to join the ecosystems of the mountains ± and from the sea involving the recovery and reconstruction of the ancestral territory through a process full of challenges and investment of time, energy, resources, experience, negotiations, a set of activities and resources tÃ© for technical and human framed in reality and cosmovisiÃ³n of PICL including women and intercultural relations

*Evidence B:* Proposed activities and results demonstrate innovation and potential for transformative results scaled to the paper.

*Evidence C:* Capacity building to retrieve AEAS of sacred sites or create shared management processes of these sites has the potential to trasmformadores results of scale.

Section 2:


Reviewer A Total Score: 38/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/40

Reviewer C Total Score: 27/40

Average Total Score: 30.33/40

Performance of Eol 299 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 5.33/6**

*Evidence A:* OGT Indígena the Organization is recognized by the Colombian State and has a history of working 33 year ± os. He has led projects ancestral system and creation of policy Pública for conservation among the SNSM PI

*Evidence B:* The proposed project presents an approach led and composed entirely of indigenous peoples

*Evidence C:* The proponent will be leading the initiative and technical support onds.

### 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 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 4.67/6**

*Evidence A:* The OGT works in protected areas that overlap with National Parks. Amazon Conservation Team in 1998 worked in the strategic lines of territory and biodiversity (with more than 70 indigenous peoples and peasant communities) and Livelihoods (Titration 800,000 hectares of safeguards throughout Colombia). With ProCAT have created tools for decision-making around the Gestión and management of the territory and biodiversity and the generation of species management plans, areas and areas of high biological interest

*Evidence B:* The document presented by interested parties shows that the main proponent demonstrates leadership in the field relevant to the proposed work

*Evidence C:* The proponent will be leading the initiative and technical support onds.

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 Reviewer C: 4/5*

**Average: 3.67/5**

*Evidence A:* They have alliances with several organizations that support the proposal with its various capabilities and experiences. As in the management and planning and protection of sacred sites, support in the research of biological resources and areas of overlap, etc.

*Evidence B:* According to the proponents of the initiative, the leading proponent has relevant experience in working with networks, alliances and organizations of Indigenous Peoples / strength of partnerships in the field. However, there is no clear involvement in the project.

*Evidence C:* The applicant is the leader of the proposal and will receive technical support and other institutions for the execution of the project

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 Reviewer C: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**



*Evidence A:* They have not executed with GEF projects. The OGT along with several organizations have developed projects with Colombia Natural Parks, Natural Heritage Biodiversity and Protected Areas. In addition realized a draft planning and environmental protection ancestral territories of Indigenous Peoples of the SNSM with the European Union

*Evidence B:* The paper demonstrates the technical capacity of the main proponent and partners to deliver the results proposed but have no experience and work with the GEF projects

*Evidence C:* The applicant and partners have shown that experience in project execution.

## 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 *Reviewer C:* 6/6

**Average: 6/6**

*Evidence A:* The OGT has carried out projects with funding \$ 350,000 dollars (36 months), E 627.376.67 Euros (72 months) and \$ 2,476,603 dollars (for 8 años). The organization produces reports and financial statements complete and delivered on time. There are external auditors for all projects handled and recommendations apply

*Evidence B:* The proposed project demonstrates that the document demonstrates the ability of financial management and projects necessary for the scale of the effort proposed

*Evidence C:* The applicant performs an annual budget over 200 thousand reais, makes accountability and performs annual external audits and meets recommendations.

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

*Scoring:*

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

*Reviewer A:* 0/2 *Reviewer B:* 0/2 *Reviewer C:* NA/2

**Average: 0/2**

*Evidence A:* He said he did not have experience with safeguards and standards required by the GEF. Indigenous Peoples because of the circumstances of our daily life are defending our rights and those of Mother Earth, we are always demanding respect for our right to self-determination, in consultation, FPIC, conditions of mutual agreement, sharing fair and equitable benefits and these defenses are part of social safeguards. Generally we apply safeguards and practice without knowing its name as a technician safeguards

*Evidence B:* The leading organization does not have experience with safeguards and standards required by the GEF

*Evidence C:* The applicant performs important projects, but said not on your experierencia with salvaguardas and other padrões exigidos GEF.

