

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 404

Organization: Asociación Forestal Indígena Madre de Dios AFIMAD

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Avecita Chicchon	404	Andes/Amazon	Peru	24	38	24	86
Christopher Jordan	404	Andes/Amazon	Peru	20	28	25	73

Performance of Eol 404 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

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The project is located in the Madre de Dios basin spanning Peru and Bolivia. It has some degraded areas but it is largely intact.

Evidence B: The Madre de Dios region is one of the most biodiverse areas in the world. The landscape appears to overlap with multiple KBAs and intact forest landscapes. Significant portions of this corridor have been deforested in recent years.

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: According to the map provided, yes - high carbon value.

Evidence B: I believe this area is around 75t/ha, but may be higher on average. The intact forests in this area are significant for climate mitigation.

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

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The proponent organization and the partner organization in Bolivia show a history of strong governance systems.

Evidence B: Much of these lands appear to be under IPLC governance, with Bolivia providing rights recently, and a significant amount of land titling for indigenous peoples has occurred in Peru in recent years, with some of that focused on the Madre de Dios region. Nonetheless, development pressure continues to be extremely strong in both Peru and Bolivia.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The project could provide a better explanation of the particularities of the diversity of peoples in the project.

Evidence B: The significance of the site is described, mainly in economic terms for Peru and in economic and spiritual terms for Bolivia.

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: There are threats of deforestation for agribusiness in Peru and Bolivia. Additionally, there is a high pressure of mining and other extractive industries.

Evidence B: The threats in both Peru and Bolivia are significant. Peru suffers from mining, illegal mining and deforestation. Bolivia has suffered from the prior administration promoting the advance of the agricultural frontier. Bolivia in particular is unlikely to improve in the immediate future given the political instability.

D) Opportunities for ICI results - including enabling policy conditions, positive government support and presence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up.

6. Are enabling policy conditions in place for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area?

Scoring:

- Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize limited rights for IPLCs over their lands and/or resources;
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There are good regulations but there will be pressure in Peru to lift environmental and social safeguards for a speedy economic recovery. This could have a negative impact in the Madre de Dios basin.

Evidence B: Peru has been actively promoting the titling of indigenous land and IPLC-led conservation in recent years. Nonetheless, despite a somewhat supportive legal framework in the context of indigenous peoples, the Bolivian government has promoted contradictory policies in recent years that resulted in the massive expansion of unsustainable agriculture.

7. Is there active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed country/area?

Scoring:

- National or sub-national governments are actively opposed to IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have recognized the importance of IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments are actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Yes, for now. This could change rapidly.

Evidence B: This response varies based on the country. Peru has been very supportive in recent years whereas Bolivia has become increasingly hostile to IPLC-led conservation. Given the decreasing support in Bolivia, I brought the score down significantly. This could change if the next administration in Bolivia is supportive of IPLC-led conservation.

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Yes, the proponent shows a history of projects that could be scaled up.

Evidence B: AFIMAD has been present and active for several years, and their initiatives were initially developed with WWF. There appears to be less experience in Bolivia, but the infrastructure and experience in Peru seems like it will be extremely beneficial in Bolivia.

E) Synergies with existing investments.

9. Are there other initiatives (relevant projects) that provide complementary support for IPLC-led conservation in the geography?

Scoring:

- Few to no complementary projects/investment;
- Complementary projects/investments are small, or are tangentially related to project goals;
- Complementary Projects/investments align strongly with project goals and investments are substantial

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

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Yes, there are some projects funded by international and national sources.

Evidence B: There is a significant amount of conservation investment in Madre de Dios, and some similar projects in the region. The co-financing appears to be biased toward Peru.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 404 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: Very well aligned. In addition, it is important to highlight the transnational focus of production groups.

Evidence B: The proposal appears to balance the sustainable development of communities and forest protection well. Nonetheless, this balance should be spelled out in more detail if a full proposal is requested for the sake of clarity.

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

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: Yes, the objectives are clear and achievable.

Evidence B: The activities in this proposal lack some detail with regard to management proposals and specific processes to achieve objectives. Nonetheless, the results are clear and significant both in terms of community well-being and forest protection. The one exception are some variation in the areas throughout the proposal and a lack of clarity about the different numbers provided.

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The document shows that the proponent has experience with this work and therefore their objectives are realistic.

Evidence B: The project includes a very large number of communities, a massive area to monitor, and the challenge of providing policy proposals to influence policies in a way that improves binational conservation. While all this is possible, and I do think that AFIMAD will contribute to overcoming identified threats and putting in place necessary enabling opportunities for IPLC-led conservation, it will be hard to achieve at such a large scale.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Yes, very well aligned.

Evidence B: The activities are aligned with the Eol range of investment, but I am concerned about the proposed scale of the project in terms of the number of communities included. If a full proposal is requested, it will be important to monitor how the budget matches the total number of communities.

5. Does the Eol 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: They do mention some sources of funding, but certainly they can do better.

Evidence B: The amount of co-financing is lacking in specifics, but it does seem that a significant portion of operating funds would be covered.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The project spans a large area and the proposal focuses on a forest economy based on non-timber forest products. If successful it would have a large impact.

Evidence B: The response in question 12 varies from other numbers listed throughout the proposal, but the project has a lot of potential. It will be important to clarify the numbers if they are invited to submit a full proposal.

7. Are the additional cultural and livelihoods results contributing to project objectives?

Scoring:

- No provided cultural or livelihood indicators for the project;
- Indicators proposed but are not clearly aligned with project goals;
- Indicators proposed and are moderately aligned with project goals;
- Additional cultural and/or livelihood indicators clearly derive from project goals

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Yes, but it could be better stated.

Evidence B: The project has a significant focus on livelihoods, so some of the indicators are closely tied to livelihoods. They did not provide additional indicators as some of the main indicators concern livelihoods.

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Yes, on the basis of a forest economy.

Evidence B: In terms of livelihoods, the project can clearly have long-term sustainability. Nonetheless, how forest monitoring and vigilance will continue is not clearly spelled out (i.e. it would have been better if the proposal explained how Brazil nut profits would be re-invested into monitoring and vigilance activities).

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: Yes, they state a clear articulation with national and regional priorities.

Evidence B: Although Peru's NDCs are not mentioned in the proposal, I think the proposal clearly understands Peru's priorities for Madre de Dios. The proposal reflects an understanding of Bolivia's NDCs and other national priorities, while at the same time showing an understanding that in practice these things may be quite different.

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: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Very clearly stated.

Evidence B: There is not a strong approach throughout the proposal to gender mainstreaming. The main strategy is to ensure that key indicators are disaggregated by gender and that some indicators monitor for the participation 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: High potential because of the tight partnership between Peru and Bolivia.

Evidence B: Given the large number of communities in the region and the support from the Peruvian government, the approach does have the potential to scale up as long as the markets for Brazil nut and other agroforestry products allow it. If they diversify their livelihoods it is likely to scale up even further. I think the scalability will increase if the next Bolivian administration is supportive of this type of initiative, but this transition of power is also a significant risk for the project.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 38/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/40

Average Total Score: 33/40

Performance of Eol 404 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: Yes. Additionally they have partnerships with local and international NGOs.

Evidence B: AFIMAD is an indigenous led organization. I was a bit disappointed that there was not more information in the proposal on their Bolivian counterpart.

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

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: Leadership on the ground demonstrated.

Evidence B: AFIMAD in particular has long-standing alliances with conservation organizations and has had their products certified as organic and fair-trade. They also appear to have a good relationship with the government and with multiple communities. Their leadership does not accept salaries.

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: There is evidence of strong partnerships.

Evidence B: AFIMAD's counterpart in Bolivia is the primary partner working on this proposal with them. The remaining organizational partners do not appear to be IPLC organizations, however I didn't score it lower given the connection with their Bolivian partner.

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: They do not have experience with GEF but do have experience with international institutions.

Evidence B: The team in Peru does seem to have the relevant capacity to carry out this project. There is little mention of the team in Bolivia, which is a concern, but I assume the the Peruvian team will help to lead in Bolivia as well. AFIMAD does not have GEF project experience.

E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the EoI demonstrate project & financial management capacity needed for scale of proposed effort?

Scoring:

- Very limited (no criteria met);
- Some capacity but would require support (1/3 criteria);
- Moderate capacity (2/3 criteria met);
- Very strong (all criteria met) with demonstrated past performance

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: This needs to be assessed more deeply.

Evidence B: They produce annual audits and have had projects over \$200,000. They do not have an extremely diversified funding streams, but given that much of their revenue comes from Brazil nut production, I think they have an additional level of resilience.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Yes. They show knowledge of safeguards with other institutions.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 24.5/30

Performance of Eol 404 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

