

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 332

Organization: Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonía Ecuatoriana

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
332	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	22	23	18	63
332	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	30	40	28	98

Performance of Eol 332 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* It is the Amazon with its global relevance and indigenous territories for its cultural significance for mankind.

*Evidence B:* Ecuador is one of the most biodiverse countries in the world. The Amazon represents 36% of the area of the country and the area of the proposed project. It is an area rich in taxonomic species, vertebrates, vascular plants, etc.

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: 2/2*

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* According to the map.

*Evidence B:* The Amazon rainforest is an important source of carbon sequestration. According to field studies on air carbon vegetation of the Amazon rainforest unhampered storage of 2,098 million tons of carbon it is estimated

### 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: 5/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* recognition processes are advanced but the state has strong restrictions for adequate participation of indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:* Nature provides home Indigenous Peoples, food and medicine., For this reason, care for and protect them with respect. Community or regional assemblies are made for making decisions, resolutions and mandates. In addition they involved the Governing Councils of the nationalities or community. Life Plans help in territorial governance and communication with local authorities and external stakeholders

#### 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:* If properly the relevance of life plans explained (for example) and how it guides the identity process of these linked towns CONFENIAIE.

*Evidence B:* The proposal explains the cultural significance of the Amazon and the great wealth of biodiversity, essential factors for the survival of Indigenous Peoples, protect their territories from extractive activities because they are a source of life and the basis for the development of cultural diversity. active in the transmission of their ancient culture, their knowledge and traditions to new generations.

#### 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: 5/5*

### **Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Amazon has many latent threats. wish to address important issues such as degradation related to the CC, the deforestation, unsustainable practices, agricultural frontier expansion arise. risks are reviewed by each sector which seeks to carry out actions of the project.

*Evidence B:* There are several problems related to climate change, due to the unequal distribution of resources and weak national implementation of agreements on forests and climate change caused by unequal power relations, causing deforestation and degradation in the Amazon. Unsustainable agricultural practices by expanding the agricultural frontier which represents 70% of deforestation along with the removal of legal and illegal timber. Due to the emergency caused by the COVID-19 and the indebtedness of the country, the Amazon is and will be the key critical point and to revive the economy without consultation procedures and the FPIC of Indigenous Peoples

## 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: 3/3*

### **Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* There are many loopholes that allow ambiguous interpretations are given on the law and the rights of peoples, as the important law of prior consultation is not binding in the case of Ecuador.

*Evidence B:* CONFENIAE has over 20 years focusing on public policy to protect the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples. He has participated in several dialogues and negotiations for the defense of life, basic human rights and especially to the territory mining projects. They know the functioning of the Socio Bosque Program for protection of forest ecosystems. CONFENIAE projects as part of the REDD + Action Plan of Ecuador. It is part of the Regional Partnership Initiative Holy Basin (for the protection of the Amazon forests)

### 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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* There is support but no real recognition that allows the rights of indigenous peoples prevail in decisions relating to their territories, in cases of exploitation of resources or in the case of prior consultation.

*Evidence B:* The Ministry of Environment of Ecuador has created some programs to reduce emissions from deforestation. For example Socio Bosque is a political commitment to protect their forest ecosystems. Ecuador applied to the Pilot Program Payment by Results of the Green Climate Fund (third stage of the REDD +)

## 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*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* some important initiatives that give rise to understand the contributions that the design ± or this project aims to promote mentioned.

*Evidence B:* There is a systematic mapping of Life Plans of the Amazon with legal and political needs that complement public policy on climate change. It is an active player in the ProAmazonia national program to subnational governments and multilateral institutions such as UNDP. CONFENIAE has developed its own Implementation Plan REDD +.

## 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:* Not clearly identify investments that can be complementary effectively but presented as alliances and participation of CONFENIAIE in such initiatives. Projects mentioned are not under why I give this qualifying.

*Evidence B:*Regional Partnership projects exist on Holy Basin on identifying sources of deforestation, design plans and promotion of local life projects bioeconomy. Involved in REDD + Working Committee of the Ecuador


Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30  
Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30  
**Average Total Score: 26/30**

*Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30*

**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 Educational Organizations (EoIs). The X-axis ranges from 0 to 30, and the Y-axis ranges from 0.00 to 1.00. The plot features two data series: 'Andes/Amazon' (represented by red open circles) and '332' (represented by a single green open circle). The 'Andes/Amazon' series shows a general upward trend, with points clustered between X=20 and X=28, and Y=0.00 and Y=1.00. The '332' series consists of a single point located at approximately (26, 0.70).

EoI	Average Section 1	Geography Overall Percentile
Andes/Amazon	16	0.00
Andes/Amazon	20	0.02
Andes/Amazon	20	0.28
Andes/Amazon	21	0.05
Andes/Amazon	21	0.22
Andes/Amazon	21	0.25
Andes/Amazon	21	0.45
Andes/Amazon	22	0.10
Andes/Amazon	22	0.28
Andes/Amazon	22	0.30
Andes/Amazon	22	0.48
Andes/Amazon	22	0.62
Andes/Amazon	23	0.15
Andes/Amazon	23	0.18
Andes/Amazon	23	0.42
Andes/Amazon	23	0.45
Andes/Amazon	23	0.48
Andes/Amazon	23	0.52
Andes/Amazon	23	0.55
Andes/Amazon	24	0.65
Andes/Amazon	24	0.72
Andes/Amazon	24	0.75
Andes/Amazon	24	0.78
Andes/Amazon	25	0.40
Andes/Amazon	25	0.72
Andes/Amazon	25	0.75
Andes/Amazon	25	0.78
Andes/Amazon	26	0.70
Andes/Amazon	26	0.75
Andes/Amazon	26	0.78
Andes/Amazon	26	0.85
Andes/Amazon	26	0.88
Andes/Amazon	26	0.90
Andes/Amazon	26	0.95
Andes/Amazon	27	1.00
332	26	0.70



## 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:* I think the proposal in general is aligned with the overall objectives of ICI and seeks to strengthen indigenous peoples' efforts through the support of an organization like CONFENIAIE.

*Evidence B:* The proposal has clear results and activities locally applicable with positive results nationally and globally. The organization is an active part of national and international programs related to biodiversity conservation and climate change through its own governance structures of support of technology in communication, etc.

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 6/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* Results and activities have good logic. I seem to be appropriate but at several points, there is a lack of specificity in the scope and become very general. I think the design should be revised to be more dimensioned to give it a concretion to the scope of the project. Activities in many cases are very relevant but few are hard to understand and which are to be applied (in communities few or all) and in that sense is that the design is or becomes very broad.

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities are relevant and possible execution. The goal is to empower Indigenous Peoples through training, advocacy at the provincial level model design management and conservation of forests that provide them items, tools and processes to sustain and continue the project once completed financing.



### 3. Will the project (objectives and activities) contribute to overcoming identified threats and putting in place necessary enabling opportunities for IPLC-led conservation?

Scoring:

- Objectives and activities do not clearly address identified threats and opportunities;
- Contributions to addressing the threats and opportunities are low;
- Contributions to addressing threats and enabling conditions are slightly over-ambitious;
- The impact on threats and enabling conditions can be realistically accomplished and are sufficiently ambitious for the projects' context

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The design ± or should be revised so that the results are clear and are not very overbroad taking into account the extension of the communities will have to cover.

*Evidence B:* Outcome 1 aims at implementing policies related to forests and climate change in the Ecuadorian Amazon, securing the rights of indigenous and local communities based on natural climate solutions. Comprehensive income is seeking the enjoyment of collective rights, protection of the territory by implementing policies.

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

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* If the design ± or revised can clearly narrowed down the scope of activities and there can best answer this question. At the moment I can only say who are partially aligned.

*Evidence B:* The proposal presents 3 results with their respective core activities to be carried out at local, regional, subregional and national levels. If they can develop the proposal in time for 5 years with the allocated budget

### 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*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The confinanciamiento is possible once further action is taken, ie it is potential. You will be achieved if moderate or could be significant. For potential being, I leave as qualifying to moderate.

*Evidence B:* CONFENIAE could raise funds from financial institutions that are supporting related to the proposal (JMG, Waterloo Foundation, HIVOS, Greenpeace, GCF, GEF) activities. Their participation in the Working Group on REDD + financing will also bring the Green Climate Fund.

**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*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* If, in the territories of peoples that make up the CONFENIAE. There is talk of a less 73,000 Ha. The former is very low and is very low, the following is closer to qualifying total has mentioned.

*Evidence B:* As the basic indicators of the GEF intend to work in an area that exceeds two million hectares. 1500 benefiting indigenous communities

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

*Scoring:*

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

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

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* These indicators They're aligned with the design directly ± or project.

*Evidence B:* There are indicators for the three proposed outcomes along with means of verification for each indicator

## 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:* If your approach seeks to strengthen territorial governance in a broader context and that plantearÃa as an important result of this proposal.

*Evidence B:* Propose the sustainability of the project in three areas: - Financial Sustainability: developing a financial strategy where activities are financed from a variety of sources, ensuring the continuity of the organization and work. - Institutional sustainability / organizational: sustaining the proper functioning of the organization, creating good institutional and administrative practices. - Sustainability program: creating the framework that will allow the project activities continue long term

## 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:* They're clearly specified and aligned with the necessary approaches.

*Evidence B:* The proposal is in line with the National Biodiversity Strategy presented by the Ministry of Environment and Water of the Ecuador and linked to national policies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The change of use and soil is related to the specified contributions nationwide.

## 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:* The gÃ©nero theme addressed is wrong. There is an explanation in generalities and not clearly explain how it is going to integrate. In the design ± or in addition it is not included in any way. No is absent but does not have a correct approach.

*Evidence B:* The proposal explains discrimination against women for being women, for their age, marital status, their economic capacity. Women suffering from family violence, economic hardship, etc. how it will seek to involve women at all stages of the project, especially in productive activities

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: 5/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* If good reviews the scope of the project, this investment can achieve results promoting larger-scale local. You can have much impact.

*Evidence B:* Is a comprehensive proposal for several purposes, the defense of the territory, the defense and security of life and the rights of Indigenous Peoples including women. Addresses the complex needs related to loss of biodiversity and the consequences of climate change both humanity and the same Mother Earth and its ecosystems


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 40/40

Average Total Score: 31.5/40

Performance of Eol 332 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* CONFENIAIE organization is proposing and is mentioned as NGO Pachamama ally.

*Evidence B:* CONFENIAIE is an indigenous organization with over 20 years of creation and operation. It is located in the Amazon region of Ecuador and the ancestral territory where fighting for the defense of life and territory. His ancestral governance system is in force and seeks to address the current needs of life, culture and identity of its members through specific projects and real.

### 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: 6/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* The CONFENIAIE has a significant leadership in their communities.

*Evidence B:* CONFENIAIE 1500 represents indigenous communities for which seeks an improvement in living conditions and the protection of its territory is sacred and it is your home. To that end it develops some national and international projects that are funded by national organizations and foreign

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

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* the relationship of the organization and the organizations that make up HATH raised as partners for execution.

*Evidence B:* For the proposal would work with the direct collaboration of the Achuar, Sapara, Kichwa, Shuar and nationalities of Ecuador. In addition it counts on the support of the Pachamama Foundation and the Interprovincial Federation of Shuar Centers.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Expertize is evidence for indigenous governance issues but not as direct executors of GEF. They must be supported by the Foundation Pachamama and / others.

*Evidence B:* CONFENIAE has gained experience with past projects and other running performed with national and international funds. communication on the situation of Indigenous Peoples of the Amazon will be promoted to the role of Digital Lancers who are young indigenous

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

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* handling capacity of USD 200k per year ± or mentioned. Could the execution of larger amounts but with support made yet.

*Evidence B:*Manages an annual budget ranging from 100,000 to 1 million. Funding comes from three sources at the least, with none of them provide more than 60%. The organization regularly produces reports that are clear and delivered to tempo financial statements. There are annual external audits

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:* His answer was no.

*Evidence B:*He answered no experience at this point



### Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/30

**Average Total Score: 23/30**

Performance of Eol 332 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

