

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 140

Organization: Autoridades Tradicionales Indígenas de Colombia – Gobierno Mayor (ATICO)

Eol Metadata

| name | Eol | Geography | state | Section 1 | Section 2 | Section 3 | Total |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Paulo Celso de Oliveira | 140 | Andes/Amazon | Colombia | 20 | 21 | 17 | 58 |
| Filiberto Penados | 140 | Andes/Amazon | Colombia | 19 | 29 | 22 | 70 |

Performance of Eol 140 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

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: transition region Orinoco - Amazonas, endemic forests; savannah and Amazon forest region.

Evidence B: important carbon reserve, largely unexplored, heavily forested

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

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Region om high tons of carbon in soil and biomass. strategic area for conservation.

Evidence B: from irrecoverable carbon map

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Indigenous forcibly we removed from this area in the '70s; fights for legal recognition since 1998.

Evidence B: The project is connected to a process to secure the territory

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: important area for cosmology Sikuni people. neighboring area of natural park where possibly there is the presence of indigenous people in voluntary isolation.

Evidence B: The indigenous communities had been forcefully removed and later returned and are reconnecting to the land. It is also an area of likely importance to an un-contacted group.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Area of the agricultural frontier. Deforestation for illegal cultivation of coca.

Evidence B: deforestation to the north of the territory due to agriculture frontier, high interest in mining in the area and limited land security present major 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 implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The Colombia maintains instances of participation of indigenous peoples related to regulation of article 8 J, the CDV. The Colombia has important legislation for reconocimiento the land rights of indigenous peoples and environmental protection.

Evidence B: Not enough information provided but from the CBD reports it seems there is some support from Colombia

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: The Colombia has important legislation for reconocimiento the land rights of indigenous peoples and environmental protection. Implementação lack of measures

Evidence B: Not enough information provided but from the CBD reports it seems there is some support from Colombia; some the projects listed were financed from state funding.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There are projects with support from NICFI and Moore Foundation. These projects related to biodiversity conservation and climatic change.

Evidence B: The work in the area of the project has been dedicated to securing some legal protection. The project mentions that : ya se cuenta con un ejercicio de cartografía social en el cual se identifican los sitios de mayor importancia cultural para las comunidades y las áreas d de mayor conflicto socioambiental". The IPLC conservation initiative seems to be emerging

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: NA/2 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Elacionasos projects are biodiversity conservation and control of climate change.

Evidence B: Three projects are listed. Though very relevant and seem to lay the foundation for the current EOI two are small.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 19.5/30

Performance of Eol 140 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 deals with the protection of land and the environmental conservation. These goals are involved in the protection of the environment and control of climate change ..

Evidence B: Though perhaps too heavy on conducting studies (which may be understandable at this stage of the process in the area), the overall goal of the project is well aligned.

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 proposal presents a list of activities, but does not explain how they will be implemented.

Evidence B: the project comes across as conducting studies and making plans and not enough details on the implementation of the plans.

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: It is a land that for over years is sought its legal recognition, LOCATION in a region with strong economic pressure. It requires more effective measures, including with the government to overcome the problems.

Evidence B: Objective two which seeks to establish alliances with public and private institutions to consolidate the protection of the territory, it would seem would go a long way in creating enabling conditions

OBJETIVO 2. Establecimiento de alianzas estratégicas con instituciones públicas y privadas para la gestión y defensa del territorio Aliwa-Kupepe. ACTIVIDAD 2.1. Establecer una agenda de trabajo con instituciones del Estado y organizaciones de apoyo para dinamizar la consolidación del resguardo indígena y el apoyo para la conservación biocultural en la zona. ACTIVIDAD 2.2. Realizar capacitaciones a la guardia indígena sobre defensa y gestión del territorio, de los recursos naturales y de la cultura. Subactividades: talleres, recorridos en campo, equipamiento, etc.

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: Whereas tra is a territory inhabited by a people distributed in 22 two communities, the activities are alcansáveis with resources.

Evidence B: they seem realistic and achievable

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 were presented that are already under discussion. The collaborate indigenous communities from their traditional knowledge.

Evidence B: Three ongoing projects are listed; they are very relevant though two are small. The commitment of partners such as WCS, NCI and Humboldt Institute seem significant

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Conservation of 51 hectares including areas of dense forest and savannah.

Evidence B: They seem to be on the low side but realistic

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: There was reference to cultural indicators, but not properly esclaredico.

Evidence B: No indicators provided for livelihood.

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 project will continue for the medium term community but was not demonstrated no measure of sustainability for the long term.

Evidence B: At the moment the project seems to be heavy on diagnostics/studies and plans and weaker on the implementation side which would mean need for funding in the future

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The development plan in 2018 and 2022 shows axes related to biodiversity conservation. The National Biodiversity Plan has no specific chapter on indigenous peoples, but their lines dialogue with indigenous peoples.

Evidence B: The project outlines the limitations of plans but identifies strategies and objectives that provide a supportive framework and to which the EOI would contribute

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There will be participation of women in courses and dialogues related activities. Missed demonstrate protagonists of women in activities.

Evidence B: equal participation; creation of strategies for increased participation; consideration of role in biodiversity management and development plans

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: The activities and results in general are related to diagnóstico and qualification of Indians. No significant innovations.

Evidence B: The project seems to be heavy on diagnostics and studies at the moment


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 25/40

Performance of Eol 140 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: In response to question 20 was presented a table with several areas, but lacks the personal framework and therefore does not present your qualifications for implementar the project.

Evidence B: ATICA is an indigenous organization but the specific indigenous groups seems to be more a beneficiary

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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: It is an organization acting in the national framework, supporting a local initiative.

Evidence B: NA

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: It has been shown that the applicant has partnerships with the local community and NGOs to propose and implement the project.

Evidence B: seems to have strong relationship with WCS and Humboldt Institute and with the Indigenous people they will be working with

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

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The organization has implemented previous projects, but has no experience with the implementation of GEF project.

Evidence B: Organization seems to have experience with project implementation

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 organization already did / does the management of other projects and prepares financial reports to undergo annual audits.

Evidence B: At least one project over 200K.

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: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The organization said only receiving international cooperation resources without the need to establish “fiducia” but if necessairo can establish this.

Evidence B: NA

Average Total Score: 19.5/30

