

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 324

Organization: Coordenação das Organizações Indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira – COIAB

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
324	Andes/Amazon	Brazil	20	25	26	71
324	Andes/Amazon	Brazil	23	30	30	83
324	Andes/Amazon	Brazil	26	32	24	82

Performance of Eol 324 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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Indigenous lands located in brasileira Amazon are rich in biodiversidade and intact forests. Indigenous lands located in this region has an important role to prevent climate change.

Evidence B: The proposed geography covered a significant portion of Amazon region, with exceptional significance in terms of importance related to biodiversity.

Evidence C: COIAB is the coordinating association (3rd level) of the indigenous peoples (IPs) in the Brazilian Amaozn. Indigenous territories represent some 22% of the Brazilian Amazon.

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: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: The Brazilian Amazon maintains high amount of carbon in soil and biomass. The areas that contain large amounts of unrecoverable carbon may warrant different strategies of conservation.

Evidence B: Most of the region covered by the proposal represent significant portions of amazonian rainforest, estimations for carbon storage represents areas with more than 100 t/ha and a significant portion with more than 150 t/ha

Evidence C: Considering indigenous territories in the Brazilian Amazon.

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

Average: 3.33/5

Evidence A: It is an organization that works with different indígenas people of Brazil, and even though the country has advanced the formal recognition of indigenous lands in the country, in practice the indígenas people do not have possession of these lands in derivations of land invasions.

Evidence B: The proposal presents a regional perspective, considering covering the whole Brazilian Amazon region. I understand that all indigenous territories already recognized are with some specific governance, including indigenous communities participation, but is not clear which specific indigenous lands will be covered by the proposal.

Evidence C: Considering indigenous territories in the Brazilian Amazon. But COIAB is the coordinating association of the indigenous peoples (IPs) in the Brazilian Amazon, mostly 3rd level. Therefore, not always in good conditions to represent each of the series of indigenous territories in the field.

4. Does the proposal explain the unique cultural significance of the area to IPLCs?

Scoring:

- No explanation given of unique significance to IPLCs;
- Significance of site(s) vaguely described;
- Unique significance of project site(s) clearly explained

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

Average: 1.33/2

Evidence A: The applicant maintained its focus in response as the importance of the autonomous management of the territory to strengthen organizations and traditional communities.

Evidence B: I understand the huge significance of the whole region to IPs represented by COIAB. But felt a lack of better description, which would be important to know better this importance to the different indigenous ethnic groups and would be more clear to understand in which part of territories the proposed actions will be implemented.

Evidence C: The written proposal does only to a certain extent. But we know the cultural importance of the Amazon indigenous territories.

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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 4/5

Average: 4.33/5

Evidence A: Are frequent land invasions by loggers, miners and fishermen. Regional infrastructure and development projects (dams, roads, mining and exploration of oil) pose serious threats to indigenous peoples and their territories. Similarly agribusiness is significant threats to indigenous peoples and to the environment.

Evidence B: Amazon region covered by the proposed initiative encompasses a huge portion of its territory under threats

Evidence C: Differentiated, but increasing threats.

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 of implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: Indigenous peoples have the legal recognition of a large part of its territory, but the political situation is not favorable to them since the federal government has adopted postures hostile against indigenous territorial rights.

Evidence B: Despite the positive evolution in terms of construction of PNGATI and other related policies in recent years, since 2019 changes in national level policies is affecting the recognition and implementation of these important mechanisms.

Evidence C: There is currently a lack of interest in implementing the good existing legal and policy framework. What makes the organization of IPs at a national level even more important.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The tual government since the election period mentioned that not demarcate any indigenous land. The initiatives related to international cooperation with indigenous peoples to protect their territories without construed as interference by the government, which also refused support from other countries to the Amazon Fund.

Evidence B: In last years, some support from national government and sub-national. But since 2019 a lot of problems related to new governments (national and subnational) related to indigenous rights recognition and lack of continuity of actions by agencies.

Evidence C: Same as above.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2.33/3

Evidence A: The applicant has experience in the political articulation of indigenous peoples and contributed to significativamente demarcation of indigenous lands defending these plays an important role for conservation. Also played a role in the creation of the National Land Management and Environmental Policy of Indigenous Lands - PNGAT.

Evidence B: There are good and positive initiatives related to implementation of PNGATI and related actions in some indigenous territories, but with difficults to scale up due a lack of support from governments, in general actions in moving on due some support from NGOs and private foundations.

Evidence C: There has been some ups and downs in the COIAB history, but it is for some years now under good direction.

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: 2/3

Average: 1.67/2

Evidence A: The applicant presented significant crespimiento donor institutions between 2017 and 2019, including projects planned to be implemntados in terms of two, three, four and five years, as shown in the document projects to be executed by COIAB ..

Evidence B: I understand that COIAB already have some support to implement actions related to institutional and capacity strenghtening. But felt a lack of clear and direct information related to especific complementary support for the initiative presented in the proposal.

Evidence C: NA

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 324 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 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposal is to support the institutional strengthening of organizations of indigenous peoples, including the applicant, the formation of lideranças and indigenous technicians, monitoring of territories and sustentabilidade economic initiatives. It is important to have a balance in institutional strengthening and investments that directly viabilizem the conservation of the environment.

Evidence B: I understand the proposal presents an important set of objectives but they are more focusing strenghtening of COIAB. But the activities and expected results are vague in define especific territories and communities where the proposl will be implement. I understnad this will still to be defined, but will be importat to a better and strng align with ICI objectives

Evidence C: Not at the top, considering the focus not so much oriented to field level conservation.

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: 2/6 Reviewer C: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The activities and the results are well olefins, but it would be important to clarify what will be the balance between strengthening activities institucionale training and rights investments in environmental conservation.

Evidence B: I felt a better definition in which areas and with which communities the activites will be focusing. I know the huge range of actions COIAB leds in the region, but in therms of especific activities and expected results, would be important to focus in especific communities and to be clear in which especific indigenous territories the actions will be implemented. Related to income

generations projects and activities, I felt a lack of information on specific initiatives already existing which would be strengthened by the proposal and more detailed information related to where actions will be implemented.

Evidence C: According to their purposes.

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

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: The proposal has the potential to respond to threats and opportunities AAs, but it was unclear whether the activities will be implemented with priority to overcome sensitive issues or to answer an institutional strengthening agenda of the applicant.

Evidence B: Objectives and activities covers well a set of institutional and networking necessary actions, but it is important to be more specific in terms of in field actions, e.g. where specific activities will be done, in which indigenous territories, etc. Will be important to do an exercise to define better how actions will be done in field

Evidence C: As most proposals.

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: 3/3 Reviewer C: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: It is possible to set a work plan with activities that are appropriate to these values.

Evidence B: I think the proposal will be adaptive in case of restriction of funds and COIAB has a good potential to find other donors to cover related or derived activities

Evidence C: NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2.33/3

Evidence A: The proponent has indicated several institutions that has the potential to support this project, especially because many of them are already supporting ongoing projects.

Evidence B: Yes, I think so, and already have important partners covering related actions to the proposal

Evidence C: NA

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: According to the proposition, the total area under improved management is 140 hectares. This area is not an insignificant space whereas in the Brazilian Amazon about 113 million ha are recognized as indigenous lands.

Evidence B: Understanding the potential COIAB has to reach an important portion of indigenous territories in Brazilian Amazon, I think the proposal is not too much ambitious to include more areas to implement actions. I believe the potential is to cover much more than 1 million hectares, but the proposal considers only 140,000 ha.

Evidence C: But the indirect good impact be enormous.

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 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: Cultural and livelihood indicators were introduced across the board. The applicant did not describe how these contribute to the objectives

Evidence B: It is not very well clear some of the cultural and livelihoods results to proposed activities, in fact I felt a lack of specific activities related to these indicators, but I consider they are indirectly related. In any case, it will be important to define better specific actions and where they will be implemented in a revision of the proposal.

Evidence C: Not at the top, considering the focus not so much oriented to field level 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: This initiative will serve to strengthen the governance of the applicant to act in defense of biodiversity in the medium term and develop strategies to pursue acting in the future.

Evidence B: The proposal presents a list of partners and donors and presented specific information on related and complementary line of actions. I understand much of necessary support is not ensured, but there is a good potential to have additional support for years to come.

Evidence C: The proposal does not at the highest level, but the results should lead to that.

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 Reviewer C: 3/3

Average: 2.67/3

Evidence A: The applicant and the indigenous peoples of basic organizações are making efforts to address the country's policies those are openly contrary to the rights of indigenous peoples and to the conservation of the environment. Therefore, the applicant defends the National Land Policy and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands, which is not only a policy to be developed by the Government shall, and yes, by indigenous peoples,

Evidence B: I believe that the proposal is well aligned with national policies and COIAB has an important role contributing to the national agenda.

Evidence C: NA

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3 Reviewer C: 3/3

Average: 2.33/3

Evidence A: The applicant mentions that gender issues are mainstreamed in all project activities and that the project foresees specific support for strengthening the network of indigenous women's organizations in the Amazon. It would be important to ensure the role of indigenous women.

Evidence B: The proposal is clear related to gender approach, presenting a series and interconnected activities and showing gender policies are already in implementation in organizational structure of the network involved

Evidence C: NA

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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 4/5

Average: 4.33/5

Evidence A: The proposal has the potential and innovative transformer long range, but it is necessary to be adjusted so that the institutional strengthening issues not prevalençam on the activities aimed at conservation. It can not be just a project to strengthen the political articulation, but, strengthen the applicant and their grassroots organizations and their role in environmental conservation.

*Evidence B:*Through the integration of the proposal's actions with actions at the national level and involvement with indigenous organizations from other regions, there is an excellent possibility of scaling up the project's results.

*Evidence C:*NA

Section 2:


Reviewer A Total Score: 25/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/40

Reviewer C Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 29/40

Performance of Eol 324 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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The applicant is an indigenous organization formed by a network of other regional indigenous organizations.

Evidence B: Yes, the proposal is led by COIAB, which imports representation from indigenous organizations in the Brazilian Amazon

Evidence C: COIAB is the coordinating association (3rd level) of the indigenous peoples (IPs) in the Brazilian Amazon.

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: 6/6 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 5.33/6

Evidence A: The applicant demonstrated that develops activities with leadership on the ground. The proposer shall coordinate a network of indigenous organizations from different regions of Amazonia basileira.

Evidence B: I understand that COIAB coordinates an important network of articulation of indigenous peoples in the Brazilian Amazon, including several sub-regional indigenous organizations in this network, in addition to coordinating actions with other regions in the country with a focus on public policies

Evidence C: COIAB is the coordinating association (3rd level) of the indigenous peoples (IPs) in the Brazilian Amazon.

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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Partnerships will be especially performed with proponent of grassroots organizations that apiarão execução the project. Also participate as a partner to APIB, which is the national framework of organization of the country, which is formed by the applicant and other regional organizations.

Evidence B: as presented in the previous justification, I understand that COIAAB has been articulating strongly with diverse indigenous organizations in the Amazon region and is also articulating with indigenous organizations and representations at the national level

Evidence C: Related to the IPs grassroots associations, to the one side, and to the national policy level organisations to the other side, as well as with the other Amazon IPs organisations outside the country.

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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 4/5

Average: 4.33/5

Evidence A: There was presented the answer on the key areas of especialização capacidde and staff regarding the proposed activity.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Despite what is written in the proposal, COIAB's experience related to GEF projects was not in managing them so far.

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 *Reviewer C:* 4/6

Average: 4.67/6

Evidence A: The Audit Report 010/2020 on page 12, makes reference to a liability in contabilidade proponent, would be important if such verufucar pendenza not undertake this initiative.

*Evidence B:*I understand that the proposed organization presents its skills and capacity clearly and with experience in projects with significant budgets

*Evidence C:*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: 1/2 *Reviewer B:* 2/2 *Reviewer C:* 1/2

Average: 1.33/2

Evidence A: The applicant replied that he has participated in discussions on the creation of indigenous GEF aimed at coservação. He did referenia the standards related to financial management required by the GEF.

*Evidence B:*the proponent presents that he has experience that includes the definition of safeguards for indigenous peoples in Brazil, regarding the implementation of GEF projects

*Evidence C:*NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 26.67/30

Performance of Eol 324 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

