

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 136

Organization: Asociación Ambiental Budi Anumka

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Alejandro Herrera	136	Southern Cone	Chile	17	28	14	59
Christopher Jordan	136	Southern Cone	Chile	18	33	19	70

Performance of Eol 136 in Southern Cone - 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* Lake Budi meets the characteristics of a wetland of marine influence, with decreasing levels of biodiversity due to the intervention of various actors extremely high.

*Evidence B:* The site includes a Key Biodiversity Area, but does not include intact forest landscapes or high density of carbon.

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: NA/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* Most of the surface of native forest ecosystems, has been replaced by spaces for the development of agriculture.

*Evidence B:* It seems that on average the site is >50t/ha.

### 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* Although Budi is one of the areas with the highest concentration of population Mapuche-Lafkenche in the region of La Araucania, Chile, it is also one of the areas of greatest historical intervention of religious groups, and in the last 30 years of state intervention in especially with regard to development proposals. It has also been an area of intervention by many NGOs since the 60s. However, there are still areas of traditional cultural expression in the field of own religion, language use, traditional sports and cooperation mechanisms economic interfamilial, basically the groups within local communities.

*Evidence B:* The lands are officially recognized as an ADI in Chile, but remain under significant threat. The threats and environmental degradation appear to undermine IPLC governance.

#### 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:* The proposal describes in detail the great cultural importance of the area is to the Mapuche-Lafkenche.

*Evidence B:* The proposal explains the historical significance of the site, the connections to local culture and cosmovision, and efforts to restore the landscape.

#### 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: 3/5*

### **Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The environmental situation of Lake Budi is extremely serious. Very difficult factors to control increasingly affect the severity of the situation: population growth and movements migration, reducing the fertile surface processes increasing erosion face of declining forest area, full eutrophic crisis Lake, loss of endemic species among many other factors.

*Evidence B:* There is evidence of deforestation and unsustainable development. The continued erosion of traditional practices and culture is another key threat. Given that restoration projects continue to be feasible and the government has started to invest in them, the threat level does not seem high.

#### 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 a number of derivative instruments of state policies that could significantly contribute to improving conditions in the area. These are well described on Eol: the Indigenous Development Area, the Hunting Area Protection, some regulations on the protection of endemic fish of the lake themselves, among other possibilities. these are present in the area since the 90s, but apparently local organizations have not achieved sufficient levels of relationship and influence with the respective public services by and for better regulation, and associated resources.

*Evidence B:* The government appears to be helping to invest in land restoration projects, and the land is recognize as an ADI. There are some laws that support IPLC-led conservation. Historical development models contradict with this progress and remain an obstacle.

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

*Scoring:*

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

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

### **Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* As described on EoI, you can access government resources, especially the Ministry of the Environment (FPAI), to finance local conservation initiatives.

*Evidence B:* While there are some laws and support mechanisms in place, it does not appear to be to an extent that justifies the highest score.

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

*Scoring:*

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

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

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The evidence provided about the experiences developed indicates that this is an aspect quite still in its infancy.

*Evidence B:* The organization itself is an example of the potential for this project to scale up, as they started in few communities and have expanded to work across the entire territory. The restoration work will also have the potential to scale up over time.

## 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:* 0/2 *Reviewer B:* 1/3

**Average: 0.5/2**

*Evidence A:* Although several small projects are described, implementers of these are basically the same, located in the same geographical area at a fairly small scale.

*Evidence B:* The projects listed in 6,7 are aligned closely with this proposal, however the overall investments appear small. There is a larger fund that was given to Chile that covers coastal management, but it is unclear if this project will be able to be connected to it.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 17/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 17.5/30

Performance of Eol 136 in Southern Cone - 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 approach developed in the proposal is appropriate and well presented.

*Evidence B:* The project's strength is in its motivation to revive local IPLC governance and culture. The scale of the project and its ability to deliver global environmental benefits is likely smaller than in other projects.

2. Does the EoI present a clear and convincing set of activities and results?

Scoring:

- The objectives and approach for this project lack clarity and cohesion, and/or do not appear to be realistic for the context;
- Activities & results defined but logic (Theory of Change) is incomplete;
- Activities and results are well-defined and cohesive but some aspects require clarification;
- The project has clear objectives and a cohesive approach with relevant activities for the context and timeline

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

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* Whereas the area of Lake Budi covers more than one hundred Mapuche-Lafkenche, many of them presenting relations minimal conflict with each other, and numerous other organizations functional local representing various territorial sectors, not shown in the EoI how we will proceed to articulate and coordinate with each other all this diversity of interests, purposes and traditional structures and / or functional objectives behind the project, and then how the participation of all these actors reach. In other words, as described on EoI, objectives and activities work well for the first 3 axes communities of the EoI, but the way scalability is achieved within the territory envisaged for the project is not appreciated.

*Evidence B:* The activities and results are strong and well organized. The project is strong overall.

### 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:* The territory has structural conditions that strengthen the exercise of growing external and internal pressures. The subdivision property taxes increased as a result of population pressure, and its impact on biodiversity, is just one of the critical factors that must necessarily be addressed in this proposal.

*Evidence B:* I believe that this project will help to revive IPLC-led conservation in a number of ways and the mix of activities (including forest restoration and cultural revival) is good for making this happen.

### 4. Are the activities achievable within a \$500,000 to \$2,000,000 USD budget range in a period of 5 years of project execution?

Scoring:

- Activities/results not aligned with Eol range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Apparently, the proposed activities are consistent with the available budget, but there is no sufficient information.

*Evidence B:* I think this project can be achieved with a budget that is within the Eol range of investment.

### 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:* Although there is evidence of other sources of cofinancing, the scale of their contribution is relatively small and not comparable with funding available from ICI

*Evidence B:* The co-financing listed is not very high, but some of the sources do appear to be sustainable and are likely to continue with a small level of core support. Perhaps the most useful source of co-financing comes from the existing nurseries that can contribute trees to 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*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* EOI considered little more than 200,000 hectares, but generally should review the figures provided in terms of area and population, as different figures are provided in other sections of the EoI, and also because they are available in numerous official sources.

*Evidence B:* The total area that will be under better management is just over 200,000 hectares. Nonetheless, the area to be restored is fairly small.

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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* There seems to be a good logical approach in this section.

*Evidence B:* The details list of indicators are clearly derived from project goals.

## 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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* EoI lacks a strong vision of sustainability in the long term.

*Evidence B:* I have marked this as high given that the infrastructure created both culturally and in terms of forest restoration should have lasting impacts on the surrounding landscape.

## 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:* matching seen in these matters.

*Evidence B:* The project clearly lists the contributions that the project will make to national priorities.

## 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*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The proposals seem solid, although a deeper reflection is needed on the postulate of achieving equal% share of women in various activities, why equal, it would be desirable to increase the proportion?

*Evidence B:* Gender mainstreaming is considered in multiple components of the EoI and thoughtfully explained in Question 15.

### 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The scale of the potential demonstrated by the experiences made is reduced.

*Evidence B:* The main limitation for scaling up the project will be the boundaries of the indigenous lands themselves and the barriers to restoration. Within the proposed study area the project will scale up in coming years and does have the potential to influence other similar contexts in Chile.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 33/40

Average Total Score: 30.5/40

Performance of Eol 136 in Southern Cone - 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:* NGO participation in this proposal seems well defined.

*Evidence B:* The proposal states that this is led by an IPLC organization. There are significant alliance with non-IPLC NGOs.

### 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 3/6**

*Evidence A:* Demonstrated leadership reaches a number of communities (3) extremely low, and a very specific territorial sector within the territory.

*Evidence B:* Given that the organization was created to enable them to scale smaller initiatives up, it appears that they have demonstrated leadership on the ground.

### 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Identifying other organizations or local communities is extremely generic, there is no specific identification of them.

*Evidence B:* The strength of the partnerships is not clearly explained, but they reference a number of communities that will be partners in the project and their roles are explained. They also mention collaborations with other entities around communications and education.

#### 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* The initiative requires the participation of professionals (indigenous where possible) of greater expertise in the sociocultural field.

*Evidence B:* The team listed seems to have a significant amount of experience in related fields. They will also have the support of experts outside of their own organization.

#### 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: 2/6*

**Average: 3/6**

*Evidence A:* Although the organization does not have the required capacity, its partners not IPLC can help overcome this gap

*Evidence B:* The organization does not do annual audits and did not provide an example of a project with a budget over \$200,000.

## 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: NA/2*

**Average: 0/2**

*Evidence A:* It declared the evidence is negative.

*Evidence B:* NA

## Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30*

**Average Total Score: 16.5/30**

Performance of Eol 136 in Southern Cone - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

