

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 378

Organization: FENAMAD

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Alejandro Herrera	378	Andes/Amazon	Peru	27	35	30	92
Isai Victorino	378	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	25	30	26	81

Performance of Eol 378 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: The project area comprises one of the most important areas for biodiversity of the continent

Evidence B: The proposed area is a corridor associated with the area of god mother, includes areas both Bolivia and Peru, has at the least two areas of sobrelapadas conservation, has a large number of threats and total number about 10 million ha.

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: The area includes areas of critical forest ecosystems in Peru and in Bolivia

Evidence B: Ranges of different areas ranging from 70 to over 100 t / 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The evidence presented can observe a large handling capacity and territorial control by the organizations. The demarcation of indigenous lands is a difficulty that exists in the area.

Evidence B: The zones are managed by indigenous organizations, but by the laws of each country and its internal problems there are limitations in decision-making and governance problems associated

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: the item is well described and based on EoI

Evidence B: In terms organizations a wide range of justifications shown and importance, yet culturally a broader explanation of peoples, cultural or practical values, sacred sites, knowledge is not given but the presence of people mentioned in isolation volunteer or initial contact, key at this point

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: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The EoI describes threats precise and detailed in

Evidence B: It is an area with high amaneza for IPLC, for several years have been working shares however the sustainability of the processes is key to continue. Threats persist and are increasing illegal mining processes, road projects, among many other illicit economies. This area requires urgent action

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: Regulatory recognition established by constitutions are a very favorable framework

Evidence B: Although political conditions are not the best in Bolivia to work with IPLC, a list of actions leading indigenous organizations in the area, and the project would help to give sustainability to the same shown. For Peru is running projects that could be consolidated within the framework of this proposal.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: In both countries (Peru and Bolivia) a legal framework sufficiently wide recognition is appreciated, but management still depends basically on indigenous initiatives rather than government

Evidence B: In the past both in Bolivia and Peru there has been strong support in promoting actions, mechanisms and projects harnessing work with IPLC, however Bolivia vision and government support is currently unclear, which in Peru if there, put REDD + projects running examples and a series of actions

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The evidence described is sufficient

Evidence B: If there is, however, given the magnitude of the threats, interests and negative impacts in the area, led by IPLC projects need more support to continue and enable their sustainability

E) Synergies with existing investments.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: The objectives pursued in other projects described are very close to conservation purposes

Evidence B: FENAMAD and Savia implement projects and activities in the area, which placed as possible projects to generate synergies. In terms of possible effective joint feasibility perceived


Reviewer A Total Score: 27/30
Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30
Average Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 26/30

A scatter plot showing the relationship between 'Average Section 1' (X-axis) and 'Geography Overall Percentile' (Y-axis) for various EoIs. The X-axis ranges from 0 to 30, and the Y-axis ranges from 0.00 to 1.00. The plot features a grid of light gray lines. Most data points are red circles, representing 'Andes/Amazon' EoIs, showing a positive correlation. One green circle, representing EoI '378', is an outlier with a high percentile (approx. 0.95) at a low average section 1 score (approx. 28.5).

EoI	Average Section 1	Geography Overall Percentile
378	28.5	0.95
Andes/Amazon	15.5	0.00
Andes/Amazon	16.0	0.05
Andes/Amazon	16.5	0.28
Andes/Amazon	17.0	0.22
Andes/Amazon	17.5	0.28
Andes/Amazon	18.0	0.18
Andes/Amazon	18.5	0.08
Andes/Amazon	19.0	0.38
Andes/Amazon	19.5	0.25
Andes/Amazon	20.0	0.65
Andes/Amazon	20.5	0.50
Andes/Amazon	21.0	0.28
Andes/Amazon	21.5	0.48
Andes/Amazon	22.0	0.52
Andes/Amazon	22.5	0.45
Andes/Amazon	23.0	0.58
Andes/Amazon	23.5	0.12
Andes/Amazon	24.0	0.15
Andes/Amazon	24.5	0.52
Andes/Amazon	25.0	0.75
Andes/Amazon	25.5	0.65
Andes/Amazon	26.0	0.78
Andes/Amazon	26.5	0.72
Andes/Amazon	27.0	0.75
Andes/Amazon	27.5	0.92
Andes/Amazon	28.0	0.70
Andes/Amazon	29.0	0.80



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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: This aligned, set a key area for the Amazon region by generating global environmental benefits, is led directly by IP and allows the support of actions that international cooperation has been supporting. It also has an international component

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: NA

Evidence B: They are clear but in terms of explaining the activity, more detail is required in the specific activity

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: NA

Evidence B: He did not have more detail and involucrar more than 10 million ha, it is possible that the proposed activities may be too ambitious.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: investment versus results and activities is within the range, but require more details

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: NA

Evidence B: If, FENAMAD presents a list of projects to articulate and co-finance mainly in Peru, Bolivia if clear action is not presented for co-financing

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: NA

Evidence B: 10 million hectares impacted by this process

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: a convincing list of indicators that includes cultural and media aspects of life presents

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: some elements are expressed, but there is no clear strategy for long-term sustainability

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: NA

Evidence B: results structure that contributes to the NDC in each country and national strategies evidence

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: So it is advisable to specify very specific processes and mechanisms of participation of women, especially regarding the mechanisms of internal recognition of their role as women leaders

Evidence B: There are clear elements associated with gender but not a clear strategy

E) Innovation and potential to scale up.

11. Do the proposed activities and results demonstrate innovation and potential for transformative results at scale?

Scoring:

- None demonstrated;
- Low demonstrated potential;
- Moderate demonstrated potential;
- Medium-high demonstrated potential;
- High demonstrated potential;
- Exceptional demonstrated potential

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: in terms of scale presents a high potential also is proposed as the continuity and sustainability of previous actions developed.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 35/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/40

Average Total Score: 32.5/40

Performance of Eol 378 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 2)



Section 3 - Qualifications and experience of the Organization (Total Points: 30)

A) Indigenous Peoples or Local Community organization legally recognized under national laws.

1. Is the EoI led by an IPLC organization?

Scoring:

- IPLC appear to be beneficiaries only;
- Combination/partnership of IPLC organizations and NGOs, and plans to build IPLC capacity over the project term are clear;
- IPLC-led approach, NGOs in more limited, defined roles (such as fiduciary);
- Fully IPLC composed and led approach

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

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Clearly, both proposing organizations as its internal composition, correspond to organizations IPLC

Evidence B: It is run by two indigenous organizations with experience, mainly in Peru.

B) Demonstrated on the ground leadership related to Indigenous Peoples and/or Local Community Conservation.

2. Does the lead proponent demonstrate on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work?

Scoring:

- None demonstrated;
- Limited demonstration of relevant on-ground leadership;
- Demonstrated on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work;
- Exceptional and long-standing on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work

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

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Both organizations demonstrate leadership, coordinated actions and processes consolidated with indigenous peoples.

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

3. Does EoI demonstrate that the lead proponent has strong partnerships, particularly with other IPLC organizations, to carry out the work?

Scoring:

- No partners defined;

- No IPLC partners identified;
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners but without clear scope (roles in project design or governance);
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners with clear roles (in project design or governance);
- Strong IPLC partnerships that play a central role in design, governance, and implementation of the project;
- Strong IPLC partnerships have a central role in design, governance and implementation of the project and linkages with national or regional IPO networks

Reviewer A: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Besides being the leading two organizations show other large organizations as beneficiaries

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: 0

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: If four proposals shows a similar amount of resources associated

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: Gef has executed projects

Evidence B: If two processes handle • FENAMAD through the experience of implementation and management of the CFP / SFP / ICCA / 2019/02 project. • Since 2013, SAP has implemented projects within the Small Grants Program of UNDP in Bolivia, as mechanisms for channeling funds from the GEF towards civil society.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 30/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 28/30

Performance of Eol 378 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

