

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 276

Organization: Unión de Comunidades Awajun Wampis para la Conservación de la Reserva Comunal Tuntanain - ECA TUNTANAIN

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Estebancio Castro Díaz	276	Andes/Amazon	Peru	24	32	24	80
Alejandro Herrera	276	Andes/Amazon	Peru	29	32	24	85

Performance of Eol 276 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: The document submitted by the applicant, the proposed region is constituted as a heritage of the nation. A Communal Reserve, is a form of conservation aimed at the preservation of wild flora and fauna for the benefit of indigenous peoples

Evidence B: The territory of the project is equal to the area of a protected wilderness area of Peru.

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 initiative presented, the proposed area is established as an important reservoir of carbon to mitigate climate change, in addition to being a territory that provides indigenous communities of important ecosystem services that benefit communities to reduce their vulnerability to the variability of the weather.

Evidence B: Is an area of critical forest ecosystems.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The area is maintained and managed by indigenous peoples under governance systems based community with some limitations. The government maintains strong control in relation to forests bordering a total exercise governance of indigenous peoples.

Evidence B: The proposing organization coadministered the protected area as the Communal Reserve Tuntanain

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

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The proposal explains in general terms of the unique cultural significance of the area for indigenous peoples. However, it mentions that the management model practiced respects collective rights indigenous territories and maintains own customs and ways of life of indigenous peoples Awajún and Wampis,

Evidence B: EOI fully describes the cultural and religious importance of the territory of the project.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The area is vulnerable to threats and risks current negative for biodiversity and for indigenous peoples as activities such as mining and illegal logging are activities that most concern to native communities for their rapid advance and few mechanisms of control and supervision by part of the state, generating loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Evidence B: mining, deforestation and agriculture are threats described in the EOI clearly.

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: Taking into account the existence of a legal and political framework strong allows for favorable political conditions for conservation led by indigenous peoples in the proposed area and government support positive and presence of successful conservation initiatives led by indigenous peoples could be extended . However, there are limitations implementation of some laws by the existing interest from the government on forests.

Evidence B: The creation in 2007 of the Communal Reserve under a regime of co-administration by indigenous communities, also including in its creation other international conventions such as Convention 169 of the ILO, and plans binational Peru-Ecuador border development, provide a solid framework for state policies to 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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: According to the document submitted by the parties concerned, there is an active government support for conservation led by indigenous peoples in the country and in the area proposed

Evidence B: Coadministration of Tuntanain Communal Reserve has as a counterpart to the National Service of Natural Protected Areas, as well as commitments of local government.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: According to the answers to question 4 and 5 and in the general document, there are successful conservation initiatives led by indigenous peoples in the proposed area that provide a base for expanding. For example, the territorial management of co-management in the area has proved successful in promoting their initiatives and projects.

Evidence B: NA

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: Other initiatives (major projects) that provide additional support for conservation led by indigenous peoples in geography as the answer to question 6 and 7 of the document. However, the document does not provide information on the time period and the amount of investment of other initiatives.

Evidence B: initiatives are presented with significant support from governments and international organizations, as well as the Peruvian State.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/30

Average Total Score: 26.5/30

Performance of Eol 276 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 1)



Section 2 - Quality and ability of the proposed approach and interventions to achieve transformational impact that generate the global environmental benefits (Total Points: 40)

A) Quality of proposed approach and ability to support traditional structures, knowledge and community practices in the delivery of global environmental benefits.

1. Is the proposed approach well aligned with the overall objective of the ICI to: Enhance Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' (IPLCs) efforts to steward land, waters and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits?

Scoring:

- Weakly aligned;
- Partially aligned;
- Well aligned;
- Exceptionally well aligned

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposed approach and ability to support traditional structures, knowledge and community practices in delivering global environmental benefits are well aligned. For example, the document presents maintain the state of conservation of the basin headwaters to ensure the provision of water quality and the health of the ecosystem inhabited by the beneficiary communities, maintain the state of conservation of breeding areas and flora and fauna, recovery of forests that provide resources ancestral use such as hunting, fishing and gathering, contribute to food security and well-being of the beneficiary communities of the area, to name a few .

Evidence B: The proposal aims to reduce the pressure of local communities and other stakeholders, on natural resources Tuntanain Communal Reserve.

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: The document presents a clear and compelling set of activities and results regarding the content and limited time period and according to the answers to questions 8 and 9.

Evidence B: It would be convenient to describe how the possible tensions that can arise between a likely increase in demand for cocoa production and commitment to restoration as part of the wider conservation strategy will be handled.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: According to the answers to questions 8 and 9 and in general, the impact of threats and enabling conditions can be achieved realistically and is sufficiently ambitious for the project context. For example, its contribution to territorial management participatory and equitable Communal Reserve Tuntanain and its buffer zone to maintain the conservation status of breeding areas of flora and fauna helps to overcome the threats identified and implement the necessary opportunities for conservation led by indigenous peoples.

Evidence B: A very significant point of this EoI is proposing a participatory and highly effective mechanism when you have a good handle on it, as is the strengthening of a cooperative of indigenous comunidades.

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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: According to the document submitted by the interested parties, the activities can be achieved within a budget range of \$ 500,000 to \$ 2,000,000 USD over a period of 5 years of implementation of the project.

Evidence B: It would be desirable to establish with certainty the precise links between the Master Plan of the proponents communities and this specific project, since the time scales are very different.

5. Does the EoI 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 document includes significant and specific sources of co-funding. However, it does not detail the period of time or the amount of direct investment in the initiative.

Evidence B: Well identified sources observed at the level of the Peruvian State and the German participation.

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: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The document submitted by the interested parties, indicates that the estimated global environmental benefits (basic indicators of the GEF) are already moderate some key indicators such as marine protected areas, marine and land restored under improved practices does not reflect global benefits.

Evidence B: The surface of the Communal Reserve Tuntanain is determined, it would be necessary to estimate the possibilities of extending the experience to the area of influence of Tuntanain.

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: According to the document, the answer to question 13 and generally clearly indicate that cultural and subsistence additional results are contributing to the objectives of the project. For example, the organization of native communities and their articulation with other organized groups, sustainable management of resources and the conservation of biodiversity.

Evidence B: relevant cultural indicators that depend on achieving the goals of the project, such as natural reduction practices and health risks are described.

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: This project will create medium-term benefits for biodiversity and governance of indigenous peoples, expected that future funding is built on this basis.

Evidence B: The consolidation of the cooperative proposal will certainly be a foundation for the sustainability of the project in the long term, given that communities already have conditions that guarantee the governance of the territory under the guise of coadministration.

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: The document aligns and contributes to national priorities as defined in NBSAPs and / or NDC.

Evidence B: a clear description of the project's contribution to national environmental priorities is presented.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The initiative reflects your document, one of his priorities is to ensure the mainstreaming of a gender perspective in managing the project, which would aim to empower women from a socio-economically and politically.

Evidence B: a proper understanding of the gender approach in the project is appreciated.

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: The document reflects the proposed activities and results demonstrate a potential medium to high potential for innovation and scale transformative results

Evidence B: The proposal presents significant potential for large-scale conservation and long term.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 32/40

Performance of Eol 276 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: The document submitted by the interested parties sufficient information has established leadership by indigenous peoples. Therefore, the focus is entirely composed and directed by indigenous communities.

Evidence B: The organization meets both formal precepts, as with previous instances and transparent experience with more power, such as various state services.

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

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The main proponent demonstrates leadership in the field relevant to the work proposed responses to relevant questions to this section according to the document submitted by interested parties.

Evidence B: At present there appear to be disapproving of records management experience Communal Reserve by the implementing organization.

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: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Regarding question 21, the document shows associations solid indigenous peoples and have a central role in the design, governance and implementation of the project and links with networks of organizations and communities of indigenous peoples at the national level or regional.

Evidence B: The relationship between the central proposal (creation and strengthening of community cooperative) and alliances reached to the present, give great strength to 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: According to the answers to the relevant questions to this section, the paper demonstrates the technical capacity of the main proponent and partners to deliver the intended results. However, they have no experience with GEF projects.

Evidence B: The organization has experience in similar projects in the administrative, but has not executed 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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The document shows that there is a moderate capacity for financial management capacity and projects necessary for the scale of the effort proposed

Evidence B: It does not appear that the proponent organization has managed projects for amounts over USD 190,000

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

Scoring:

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

Reviewer A: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The leading organization has experience with safeguards and other standards required by the GEF but does not specify on the safeguards required and used on other standards.

Evidence B: It is assumed that his experience comes from projects with Germany and state sources.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 276 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

