

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 185

Organization: Associação Floresta Protegida

### Eol Metadata

| name                    | Eol | Geography    | state  | Section 1 | Section 2 | Section 3 | Total |
|-------------------------|-----|--------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Paulo Celso de Oliveira | 185 | Andes/Amazon | Brazil | 20        | 21        | 25        | 66    |
| Claudio C. Maretti      | 185 | Andes/Amazon | Brazil | 27        | 33        | 21        | 81    |
| Carlos César Durigan    | 185 | Andes/Amazon | Brazil | 29        | 39        | 27        | 95    |

Performance of Eol 185 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 Reviewer C: 5/5*

**Average: 4.67/5**

*Evidence A:* This is territory rich in biodiversity.

*Evidence B:* Medium-high level for species and some KBAs around, but important intact forests, core of a very large remnant block.

*Evidence C:* the geographical area presented in the proposal is extremely significant, enhanced by the high degree of threat it has. In addition to including in its limits a high diversity and presence of rare and threatened species.

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:* Area of high tonne of carbon in soil and biomass.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* the proposal clearly presents the importance of the proposed area in terms of carbon stock and regional and global importance in terms of climate change

### 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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 2/2*

**Average: 5/5**

*Evidence A:* The Kayapo exercise the traditional governance of their territories.

*Evidence B:* Well known case. (Although there is a smaller part of the area more under attack for quite some time, as the proposal admits.)

*Evidence C:* the proposal is presented on a recognized indigenous territory with a strong local governance component of the Kayapó people

### 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 Reviewer C: 2/2*

**Average: 1.67/2**

*Evidence A:* The proposal explains that the Kayapo depend on the forest to live and maintain their culture.

*Evidence B:* It does not to the extent possible, but we know it is of high importance for sociodiversity .

*Evidence C:* the proposal presents very well the relationship of the kayapó people with their territory and the significant relevance of this area for these indigenous people

### 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 Reviewer C: 5/5*

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

*Evidence A:* Invasions by miners who illegally exploit the gold, illegal logging of Maderia and aspoliticas the current government is reportedly opposed to the rights of indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:* According to Cumulative Development Pressures, it is more medium level. Nevertheless, according to the proposal, and the surrounding context, we can score a higher level.

*Evidence C:* the proposed area is located in a region where impacting and threatening processes are advancing on the Kayapó people, especially considering the current political situation in Brazil, as mentioned in the proposal.

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

### **Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* The initiatives of international cooperation with the indigenous people of Brazil should be scorm exclusvamente with these people and their organizations. whereas the current goveno since the election period was against indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* the proposal clearly presents the legal bases that govern the actions underway in the indigenous land in question, demarcated and with ongoing actions to build actions aimed at the implementation of PNGATI

### 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:* Before the current government and the National Environmental Policy Land Management in Indigenous Lands was an innovative initiative that strengthened governance of indigenous peoples, but this policy has been weakened.

*Evidence B:* The governmental related regulations, decisions and actions are fundamental, but their implementation does not go as far as needed.

*Evidence C:* I understand that despite clear policies and laws aimed at protecting indigenous lands in Brazil, the area in question currently suffers from the political changes that took place in 2019 and it is evident the lack of current support from the agencies responsible for supporting indigenous peoples, who have frequently resorted to justice in order to advance on their local agendas

## 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: 3/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.67/3**

*Evidence A:* The Caiapó has important experiences in managing their territories, which includes the creation of surveillance posts in the areas of border their territories.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* an evident protagonism of the kayapo people is presented in the search for consolidation of activities aimed at the management and conservation of their territory and natural resources

## 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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

## **Average: 1.67/2**

*Evidence A:* There are other relevant initiatives to support complementary to the Basics Environmental Programs, which are resources to compensate indigenous communities for any impacts to their territories, eg Valley company.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* A robust organization of the Kayapó people and their representations is presented, including important partnerships and support, as well as resources provided from donations and projects already approved

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 29/30

Average Total Score: 25.33/30

Performance of Eol 185 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* Yes, it is proposed to strengthen the governance of Caiapó and conservation of the environment.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* I understand that the proposal is extremely aligned with the global ICI objectives

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 Reviewer C: 6/6*

**Average: 4.67/6**

*Evidence A:* It is the strengthening of economic capacity of Caiapó and conservação and protection of the territory of this people.

*Evidence B:* This is a complementary effort, aligned with a larger strategy, but delivering a smaller part of the text statements. So, a real project proposal (next stage) shall need to clarify the differences between the expectations raised by the text and the real achievements possible by this project.

*Evidence C:* I think the objectives and activities are very well structured and articulated, as well as being consistent with the identified needs.



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: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Support for the development of economic activities of Caiapó could serve to counter the current economic model predatporio, pressing the use of natural resources Caiapó.

*Evidence B:* The concrete proposed results might be achieved, but the text raise larger expectations. See above.

*Evidence C:* the objectives and activities are very well structured and articulated and I believe that as proposed, it is placed in a very realistic and consistent with the needs presented

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: 3/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The aatividades and results of the project will be able to adequately meet the initiative of the Kayapo

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* the activities are very well articulated and planned and must be well executable with the proposed resources.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 2.67/3**

*Evidence A:* Leading NGOs work with the proponent, which has important traditional environmental experience and through partnerships.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* Yes, even the proposal mentions that a considerable amount of funds is already available to complement the proposed actions

**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: 5/5 Reviewer C: 5/5*

**Average: 4.33/5**

*Evidence A:* Total area under improved management 9.4 million hectares.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* Yes, extremely, the proposal has an estimated area of more than 9 million hectares

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: 3/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* It includes the income generated from the value sustainably and equitably distributed, flowing paraComunidades Kaiapo.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*the indicators are clearly aligned and bring important gains to the strengthening of governance and protection of indigenous land

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

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The proposal will be presented as the activities after the end of this project.

*Evidence B:*The long term strategy is not clear enough in the proposal, but to keep the indigenous peoples communities strong is a key one, as well as to fight invaders. Also, there are other initiatives in the region to assure continuity.

Nevertheless, what is not clear, mostly, it is the nature of the main organisations (mainly the “Associação Floresta Protegida”, as well as the “Instituto Kabu” and “Instituto Raoni”) – although stated as indigenous peoples organisations, with kayapos at the decision level, all behaviour and performance indicate international NGOs-like style. For this question, the point being on the indigenous grassroots organisations long term capacity to relate to such external initiatives.

*Evidence C:*considering the long experience and mobilization of the kayapó people in project management, there is a very good potential for continuity of actions and continuity in attracting support from funds and other organizations

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

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* Currently the policies of the Federal Government shall in Brazil is contrary to the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:NA*

*Evidence C:*There is a strong articulation of the proposed actions with actions of national nature regarding the implementation of conservation mosaics and policies related to the consolidation of indigenous territories through the so-called PNGATI, which inserts the protection actions for indigenous lands in the national and regional conservation agenda.

#### 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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The Kayapo Manté respect for women and will support their participation in the project.

*Evidence B:NA*

*Evidence C:*the proposal presents a strong active initiative aimed at a gender perspective, strengthened in the indigenous organization, both in communities and in their representations

#### 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5 Reviewer C: 4/5*

**Average: 3.33/5**

*Evidence A:* AAs activities Innovate when dealing with the strengthening of governance, environmental conservation and sustainable economy, with the potential to transformadosr results laarga scale.

*Evidence B:NA*

*Evidence C:* I understand that the Kayapó indigenous people have been very well articulated over the years and this proposal has a high potential to contribute to the ongoing process of transformation and organization.

Section 2:


Reviewer A Total Score: 21/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 33/40

Reviewer C Total Score: 39/40

Average Total Score: 31/40

Performance of Eol 185 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: 2/6 Reviewer C: 6/6*

**Average: 4.67/6**

*Evidence A:* The proposal is presented by indigenous organizations in partnership

*Evidence B:* The nature of the main organisation is not clear, mainly the “Associação Floresta Protegida”, as well as the associate “Instituto Kabu” and “Instituto Raoni”. Although stated as indigenous peoples organisations, with kayapos at the decision level, all behaviour and performance indicate international NGOs-like style.

*Evidence C:* I understand that the proposal is elaborated by AFP, but that there is a strong interaction between it and the organizations and communities of the Kayapó people, both in the construction of activities and in the execution of them.

### 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 Reviewer C: 6/6*

**Average: 5.33/6**

*Evidence A:* The applicant develops liderança recognized in the territory.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* I understand that the proposal is elaborated by AFP, but that there is a strong interaction between it and the organizations and communities of the Kayapó people, both in the construction of activities and in the execution of them.

C) Proven relevant experience in working with IPLC networks, alliances and organizations/ strength of partnerships on the ground.

3. Does Eol 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:* The institutions have the important role in the territory.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* the proponent demonstrates strong interaction with other local, regional, national and international organizations. I understand that it has a central role in the construction of actions and in the facilitation and execution of activities at different levels of cooperation.

D) Technical expertise and capacity to address environmental problems, root causes and barriers.

4. Does Eol 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5 Reviewer C: 4/5*

**Average: 3.67/5**

*Evidence A:* The applicant has experience in exucução projects demonstrating his technique capaciade.

*Evidence B:* NA



*Evidence C:*the proposing organization has high technical and operational capacity to implement the project, but has no experience with GEF projects

### 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:* 6/6

**Average: 5.33/6**

*Evidence A:* The applicant has diversified flows and manages an annual budget in excess of \$ 200,000.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*the proposing organization demonstrates strong fund management skills

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

*Scoring:*

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

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

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 27/30

Average Total Score: 24.33/30

Performance of Eol 185 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

