

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 133

Organization: Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia ONIC

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
133	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	23	28	20	71
133	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	20	28	24	72

Performance of Eol 133 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The proposal is not specific to a geographical area, offers opportunities and benefits of actions under various conditions of landscape with interest and importance of biodiversity

Evidence B: A the least 80% of the proposed spaces are linked directly with the priorities of the country and conservation are aligned with climate priorities and carbon stocks key.

However, the description within these areas the proposal is very general and does not provide sufficient detail as to express its importance locally, nationally and internationally in environmental terms. This occurs, probablemente because the proposal does not provide for direct implementation actions associated with the management of biodiversity, ecosystem services and conservation actions, restoration and sustainable management, so that the areas would not be impacted directly, but indirectly by implementing actions of capacity building in monitoring own research, and strengthening of a monitoring system, which is very important but not articulated clearly and strategically with component 1 I ICI, only component 4.

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: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: On the national level of the proposal in Colombia, an area of mid-level climate mitigation, because of the diverse ecosystems that provide care areas is estimated the proposal.

Evidence B: The area has a moderate score in relation to carbon, however, a proposal being associated with the establishment or strengthening of an information system, actions would not present impacts on proposed areas directly.

If the proposed actions focus on specific analysis windows with some of the areas proposed for example Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, or Amazon could be clearer on the impact on mitigation actions.

B) Geographical focus in an area under IPLC governance.

3. Is the area held and managed by IPLC under community-based governance systems?

Scoring:

- IPLC governance (rights and institutions) not evident;
- Project areas are marginally under IPLC governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are partially under IPLC systems of governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are largely under IPLC governance, but IPLC rights and/or institutions face significant constraints;
- Project areas are held and managed under IPLC governance systems, with some limitations;
- Project areas are held and managed under strong and active IPLC governance systems

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

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Areas IKS low autonomy, Colombian legal regime

Evidence B: Areas representing the ONIC (proposing organization), included in this proposal, presented mostly strong systems of autonomous governance, but as mentioned in the proposal, there are still severe limitations in decision-making at regional level, mainly associated with issues of environmental governance and effective participation. The proposal could strengthen these gaps so that decision-making more effective and inclusive.

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: High diversity of peoples covering more than 550 indigenous reserves, which benefit from the policies pursued by the proposal.

Evidence B: Shows the importance of the sites generally, however there is no specific description of the importance of these territories to the cultural management, there are no differences of each, or a little explanation of its importance in maintaining cultures, practices, knowledge according to the specific vulnerability area.

For example ONIC manages some macroterritorios as geographically specific divisions in Colombia, and also handle regions, both categories differ in terms of cultural practices, states, among others; a description of these macroterritorios and its importance would be useful to strengthen the proposal and give more arguments regarding activities.

C) Vulnerability of the proposed IPLCs as well as their lands/waters/natural resources to threats.

5. Is the area vulnerable to threats/current risk of negative impacts to IPLC and biodiversity without action?

Scoring:

- No evident threats;
- Low threats;
- Moderate threats;
- Medium-high threats;
- High threats;
- Requires urgent action

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: ONIC indigenous peoples are facing anthropogenic pressures on security and use of natural resources, so the same pressure on biodiversity loss

Evidence B: Threats exposed are general and give warning of the need to strengthen and consolidate actions in relation to the objective of the proposal. However, he did not itemize the territories whether by macro territories or regions as is established in the MPC (Permanent Concertation Table), there is no clarity of specific risks or windows more specific action urgency could work. The problems of fires in the Amazon and Orinoco region are mentioned, but these do not describe the risks, threats and vulnerability of this region.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: 0

Evidence B: In the current regulatory frameworks, different tools both national and subnational indigenous public policies that favor the effective participation as the MPC Permanent Bureau of Indian Coalition, MRA Mesa Regional Amazon, among others; it is worth noting the statement made by the ONIC on the current development plan and the commitments five raised, as these would facilitate the implementation of the proposal, supporting both the environmental commission indigenous nationally as monitoring actions effective over the territories.

The proposal has direct support from the Research Institute Alexander Von Humboldt, an organization in Colombia responsible for ensuring the national information system biodiversity, because the availability of data, platforms and personnel would be guaranteed for the creation of this information system.

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: There are efforts from national and subnational levels, however they are not a priority in national policies.

Evidence B: There is active government support, however in the current government's political will are unclear. The positive point of this proposal is that it has direct support from a government institution ensuring the sustainability of it in time.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The political challenges of autonomy and defense of the collective heritage are evident and represent important lessons learned, support is required to consolidate sustainability process on security of tenure and biodiversity including traditional knowledge and practices

Evidence B: There are some initiatives, but all are based on cooperation resources so it is not guaranteed the continuity of the same over time. Faced with own information systems other organizations have developed similar actions but without much follow-up

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

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Projects are presented without much impact clear scale and resources, however the ONIC showing growth in building partnerships. Do actions with RRI ?, what kinds of synergies could be developed on rights?

Evidence B: The proposal is based on a joint exercise with the Research Institute Alexander von Humboldt IAVH, so there is a clear synergy, efficient and effective with the objectives of this project. The IAVH, has the responsibility to manage the information system biodiversity of Colombia, so this would allow articulation develop a differentiated approach in this system.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 21.5/30

Performance of Eol 133 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: Has given a clear objective, you can extend the mechanisms for access and use from the various stakeholders of the IPLC.

Evidence B: Having an information system itself and focused on indigenous peoples and aligned to the currently existing systems in Colombia, would contribute to the objective of the ICI mainly in component 4, however not having concrete actions in the field there is a gap that could be improved a possible structure

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Importantly actions governance and empowerment strategy from IP communities that will benefit from the project.

Evidence B: There is a general objective and specific objectives documented, but there is no clarity within the framework of actions, results and / or intermediate results to be achieved, this is a clear gap in the expression of interest.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Improving information and communication systems are key, so it should promote an early warning system for homeland security and to further clarify the mechanisms of participation of grassroots communities.

Evidence B: Although generally provides and indirect threats expressed, the proposal lacks a concrete implementation actions in the field, this weakens conservation opportunities in specific indigenous territories

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Should be expanded in the process of empowerment from community members and the impact on information systems, monitoring and early warning for territorial defense and security as well as traditional knowledge

Evidence B: There are no actions raised, there are some objectives described that if they could be achieved with the resources raised, but the disregard the specific activities and alacance of them can not claim full alignment.

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: Ecosystems in indigenous territories in Colombia are of global conservation interest, financial synergy effort is greater than the pro presented the initiative.

Evidence B: There is a clear action between IAVH (national institution allied to this proposal), the ONIC ensuring co-financing in terms of human and technical resources, but there is no clarity in financial terms if there could be co

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: It is relevant scale in terrestrial, lacustrine and marine

Evidence B: Exposed in the proposal is -very highly, however at this point I do not see clearly the direct impact on the 23 million hectares proposed; an information system would contribute significantly in terms of environmental governance and decision-making, but having no direct implementations over the territories consider reassessing this category

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: You can be more specific and detailed, especially in the use and conservation of traditional knowledge and practices

Evidence B: If there are results clear on this point, since a differential approach to monitor indigenous territories would be established with a differential approach, which account for about 30% of the territory of the country and contribute directly to the ecological structure of the nation

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: It is clear the usefulness of benefits, the input source is identified to keep the information system, but does not make clear how the operationalization of the system and the ability of communities to access for the use of the same will remain

Evidence B: The project clearly strengthens indigenous governance systems because it is aligned with two rigs under construction in Colombia. In addition implement a differentiated approach in a system that never has had processes could encourage participatory decision-making, however ensure their functionality depends on some specific actions that are not yet described in IE

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: relations with national policies are clearly stated, however it reduced the scope proposed in the objective and activities

Evidence B: The proposal relates to both priorities clearly, additionally the ONIC presents the commitments of the government within the development plan in their specific paragraphs, these commitments were the basis of the Indian chapter with the current government 2018 - 2022, so the action framework of the proposal is highly associated.

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: Importantly accompanying mechanisms and processes to improve access to gENDER information systems, so it is required to recognize gender variables and indicators systems in the IPLC information.

Evidence B: Although clearly mentions the gender approach, the spaces created and resources; not express how these are linked to the implementation of the proposal.

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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: It's a good challenge requires more detail how it will access and use from the communities in the defense of the tangible and intangible heritage.

Evidence B: An information system with differential approach to indigenous peoples, articulated to the state institutions and the structures of governance and indigenous governance, and also provide additional information for decision-making at regional level, it is highly innovative; although there are complementary information systems such as the OPIAC, it is not yet established a unique and constant monitoring platform. However the absence of proposed activities within this expression of interest the actual final scope of the proposal is unknown


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/40

Average Total Score: 28/40

Performance of Eol 133 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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: 0

Evidence B: ONIC is the principal applicant, but is associated with IAVH is not an NGO, but it is an institution of mixed nature (public-private) for the implementation of the proposal, but the experience of the ONIC and his technical team It ensures a targeted approach by IP

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: It is important to establish a protocol cogobernanza of I project with broad and effective participation of organizations from Colombia IPLC

Evidence B: In Colombia demonstrates leadership on the issue, has a territorial monitoring system operation and ally (IAVH) is a key partner to fulfill the objective of the proposal. Currently in the context of the pandemic, they have demonstrated continuous monitoring of the impact on the territories, demonstrating its ability to implement the proposal

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: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: It is necessary to define the governance framework of the proposal.

Evidence B: ONIC is part of the national consensus MPC space, it has partnerships with regional organizations and communities in the territory, in the same way dialogues with other national organizations. Generally it demonstrates solid alliances for guaranteeing the implementation of the proposal

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: It is necessary specialized technical assistance in the design of products and intercultural dialogue to achieve a system useful, accessible and culturally relevant response information problems faced by IPLC in the defense of the collective heritage.

Evidence B: Although they have no experience with GEF funds, if they have received support from other international donors. In technical terms the alliance partner has excellent and highly experienced in the objective proposed in the proposal,

E) Project Management capacity.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: support for capacity building is required, it must identify the main requirements demanded by ONIC

Evidence B: The budget ONIC handles over 3 million annually by 2019, has an administrative structure clear

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: 0/2

Average: 0/2

Evidence A: Not

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 133 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

