

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 245

Organization: Unión de Organizaciones Campesinas e indígenas de Cotacachi

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
245	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	27	25	21	73
245	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	15	27	25	67

Performance of Eol 245 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: 3/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Region with significant agricultural biodiversity, with many of these endemic characteristics.

Evidence B: connectivity to biocultural regions and high levels of agro-biodiversity

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: Region moderate amount of carbon in soil and biomass. The area has moderate importance to mitigate climate.

Evidence B: not indicated. from irrecoverable carbon map indications are that it is moderate to high

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: 1/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Area with relevance in establishing trajectory of indigens and peasant associations. The UNORCAC - Organizations Union Canpesinas and Indígenas of Cotacachi acts as a second-level institution in the territory and defend the good life. La UNORCAC presenta su visión to as “representative una organización social, territorial con jurisdicción dentro del canton Cotacachi, claim la justicia social, ecological, economic y en el reconocidos are national and international scope. Nuestras communities, y familias organized groups actively PARTICIPANTS en la construcción del Buen Vivir - Alli Kawsay. Tenemos una identidad cultural territorial y fuerte, y revalued reserve them conocimientos y ancestral knowledge. Un apply economic model basado en el respeto a la Pacha Mama y la reciprocity, we con tierras fertile, productive y desarrollamos complementary activities a la agricultural labor. All y all participated in una educación y un sistema de salud de calidad. Y are propositional critics, promoted her praxis de la interculturalidad y la concreción de una sociedad fair y solidarity”(Plan de acción UNORCAC 2008-2018).

*Evidence B:*Not indicated clearly

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: actively participate in the construction of well-being. There is a strong cultural identity and territory and redevelop the ancestors conhecimntos.

*Evidence B:*The importance of agrobiodiversity and its linkages with indigenous culture explained

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: The migration of farmers to the city as a result of land poucoespaço (half hecatere per family), which has led young people to abandon agricultural activities, hampering the transmission of traditional knowledge. Substitution of native varieties of improved varieties. Tendency of market homogenize the product and decrease the providers.

Evidence B: migration, substitution of crops, changing eating patterns and market changes is affecting agrobiodiversity negatively.

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The applicant incentia agrobiodiversity enhancing the continuity of the continuity of production and consumption of foods in location, performing exchange des seeds and conservation education.

Evidence B: the area is part of a UNESCO Geo park. The area can be recognized as agrobiodiversity area and indigenous territories has been proposed as a Sistema Ingenioso de Patrimonio Agrícola (SIPAM)

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: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: En 2019 the municipal government del canton There En el año 2019 el gobierno del municipal conton Cotacachi approve a municipal ordinance to protect and promote agrobiodiversidades, conocimientos, MANIFESTACIONES culturales Asociadas knowledge to it. The province of Imbabura, where are located the indigenous communities of Cotacachi was declared by UNESCO as a World Geopark.

Del canton Cotacachi, esta es una local public policy that will allow y asignar technical economic resources to acciones de la conservación.

Evidence B: The area can be recognized as agrobiodiversity area and s has been proposed as a Sistema Ingenioso de Patrimonio Agrícola (SIPAM) by the Ministry of Agriculture

8. Are there successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives in the proposed area that provide a foundation for scaling up?

Scoring:

- No IPLC-led conservation initiatives have been implemented;
- Few IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented in pilot stages only;
- Some IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented beyond pilot stages;
- Relevant IPLC-led conservation projects have been well established for many years

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The applicant has been awarded by UNDP in 2008 with the award as Ecuatorial reconocimiento results in reducing the extraordinaios daspobreza through conservation and use biolpogica support diversity.

Evidence B: several initiatives are described

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:* 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: The National Institute of Agricultural Research - INAP and North Technical University of Ecuador are developing a project to strengthen the indigenous communities of Cotacachi in the conservation and use of RFAA. FAO Ecuador supports the value chain strengthening project, inclusiva and diverse family and peasant agrigultua this region.

Evidence B: 5 initiatives with significant level of relevance listed


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 15/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 245 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposal is aimed at the protection of agro-biodiversity and strengthening governance.

Evidence B: The project is centered around the agrobiodiversity of indigenous communities around which much communities cultural practices and knowledge is sustained and an important strategy biodiversity conservation and

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: The applicant mentions as activity “establecimiento y formal reconocimiento territorios de bio culturales ...” But does not explain what is the current situation of recognition of these territories, which is necessary for recognition as a cultural bio territory

Evidence B: The five results proposed would work cohesively: recognition of the territory as an biocultural region; securing rights to land and water; regeneration of soils and ; improved economic benefits

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: several problems related to the conservation of agrobiodiversity were mentioned, but the activities and solutions have no clear answer to all of them, eg the migration of farmers to cities for lack of land, replacement of native varieties for improved varieties.

Evidence B: If the main challenge is the erosion of practices that sustain agrobiodiversity as a result of migration, loss of income, market demands, the project seems to address these.

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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The activities and the results are aligned with the investment group, being able to adjust the budget to the work plan to be drawn.

Evidence B: The activities seem doable within the five year period and they would not exceed the \$2M

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Important institutions already active in this area, but it was not mentioned the budgets invested by them (Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Fomento (INIAP), North Technical University (FAO Ecuador and Ecuador).

Evidence B: 4 projects are listed and it is indicated that the communities can also contribute

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

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Surface total improved management: 16,000ha. The benefits are moderate.

Evidence B: agrobiodiversity is contingent on the social and cultural practices and knowledge of IPs and is potentially an a good platform for biodiversity conservation. The success of the project would produce interesting lessons

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: a list was presented with possible indicators but without quantify.

Evidence B: a long list of indicators are provided.. these might need more thought

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The applicant reported that 20 years of management national and international cooperation projects, which means the potential to continue presenting proposals for new calls. Communities that cultivate agrodiversity maintain the continuity of conservation.

Evidence B: The organization has longstanding presence in the region seems to have potential for future funding that would consolidate the results. Obtaining recognition for the region as an important biocultural region would strengthen the position of the communities to obtain further support

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: The The proposal aligns with the Naciona Biodiversidade Strategy 2015-2030, which has poles lines that relate to the conservation of agricultural biodiversity.

Evidence B: Contributes to the following strategies: Estrategia Nacional de Biodiversidad 2015-2030; Sector: Soberanía Alimentaria, Agricultura, Ganadería, Acuicultura y Pesca; and water strategy

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: In the communities of the Cotacachi maiora of agricultural activities are in the hands of women who are considered guardians of Semene and cultural identity. The proposal was approved by the proponent and its Central Committee of Women.

Evidence B: Project has a strong focus on women participation

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: It is relevant to the protection of the territory and of agricultural biodiversity.

Evidence B: Agrobiodiversity as a key platform for biodiversity conservation is of significance to Indigenous peoples. It is an area around which important social and cultural practices and knowledge are sustained. The success of the project would produce important lessons


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/40

Average Total Score: 26/40

Performance of Eol 245 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The tenderer is not specific specialized areas and the working capacity of the people who are part of the technique is equi exclusiva it própria or execute the project with the other institution that already operates in the territory together.

Evidence B: The organization is a collective of indigenous and peasant organizations

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The proponent desenpenha important work leading a network of local organizations and already performed significativos projects in the territory.

Evidence B: The organization seems to have a long history of presence and action in the area of the project

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Sm, shows that partners with organizations from its base and public agencies.

Evidence B: the organization is a collective of grassroots organizations and seems to have alliances with other NGOS and academic institutions who would play a supportive role

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 organization states that have previous experience with the GEF.

Evidence B: The organizations seems to have experience and expertise to support the project. No experience with GEF

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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The applicant has demonstrated that experience in managing projects with values above \$ 200,000 and carries out external audits in accordance with the terms set with donors.

Evidence B: Seems to have experience with several projects over \$200000

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: The organization said that executes project funded by FAO ..

Evidence B: yes. limited explanation provided

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 245 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

