

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 391

Organization: ANECAP

Eol Metadata

| Eol | Geography | state | Section 1 | Section 2 | Section 3 | Total |
|-----|--------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| 391 | Andes/Amazon | Peru | 20 | 21 | 16 | 57 |
| 391 | Andes/Amazon | Peru | 21 | 29 | 22 | 72 |

Performance of Eol 391 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: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Bosques amazónicos de reservas comunales en la Amazonía, la cual es de suma importancia global para la biodiversidad y el mantenimiento de la riqueza cultural.

Evidence B: The focus region is located in the Southern Tropical Andes. It is a hotspot for biodiversity in an intact forest area.

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: Las principales reservas que presentan están en zonas para la mitigación al CC en la Amazonía.

Evidence B: According to the map, all locations are in high carbon areas.

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Las reservas en mención tienen la figura de administración para la gestión entre el estado peruano y las reservas comunales. Se otorgan derechos de uso pero es un ejercicio de co-administración. La implementación tiene limitantes de capacidades y financiamiento.

Evidence B: The project is presented by the network of communal reserves. Communal reserves are managed with SERNANP (Peruvian protected area agency).

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: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Se explica la importancia de estos espacios pero es demasiado amplia y en cierto punto general.

Evidence B: There is a diversity of indigenous peoples included in this project. Their cultural particularities are described partially but well enough to understand their significance.

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: Esta zona tiene altas amenazas y son expresadas en la propuesta: deforestación, cambio climático, cambio de uso de suelo, minería, extracción ilegal de recursos, cultivos ilícitos, carreteras. Estas zonas tienen diversas y crecientes presiones.

Evidence B: Indigenous groups have the responsibility to manage communal reserves but lack the capacity and the resources to face the threats. Yes, they are vulnerable.

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: La propuesta aporta a fortalecer la figura de coadministración entre las reservas comunales y sus paisajes asociados con el estado. Es una acción innovadora y con mucho potencial. Sin embargo, la propuesta menciona que hay limitaciones en cuanto a capacidades y para lograr el financiamiento para su sostenibilidad.

Evidence B: There are laws and regulations that are not enforced.

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: Evidentemente a nivel legal y en particular porque el estado es firmante de los contratos de administración comunales.

Evidence B: Communal reserves are regulated and promoted by the 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Se mencionan varios tanto de la institución ANECAP como la asociada DRIS.

Evidence B: The Communal Reserve Amarakaeri is a success story that could be scaled up despite the big challenges they face in their buffer areas (gold mining).

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: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Se vinculan varias iniciativas que se implementan tanto por la institución proponente así como los otros ejecutores de contratos de administración en las reservas comunales

Evidence B: There are a few government initiatives that may be aligned with this project.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 20.5/30

Performance of Eol 391 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: En su conjunto está alineada la propuesta para fortalecer-aportar a los principios de ICI.

Evidence B: The focus on communal reserves can yield important results.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Existen resultados y actividades bien definidas pero son extensas. Esta propuesta necesita contar con un marco lógico o una planeación que aterrice sus intereses en los resultados. Los conceptos son adecuados y tienen enfoque necesita clarificar el alcance de la propuesta. Me parece irreal si se cree que en 4 años se va a lograr todo lo planteado en las 3 RC.

Evidence B: There are some aspects that require clarification such as the manner in which 'vigilance' will be deployed without putting indigenous peoples in harm's way.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Este es el problema de la propuesta: es extensa y sobre dimensionada... puede caer en generalidades. Es necesaria enfocarla, pero tiene los argumentos de abordar los principales amenazas que se de identifican. NecesitarÃa acotarse para mejorar.

Evidence B: Objectives and activities are clear but need to be more realistic.

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: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Le he dado esta asignaciÃ³n proque no es que no estÃ¡n alineados con la inversiÃ³n, pero si se acota mejor o se clarifica el alcance se podrÃa por supuesto lograr varias de los resultados con el presupuesto.

Evidence B: It is achievable if well managed.

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: Existen varias incitivas a las que se pueden articular en términos de cofinanciamiento.

Evidence B: The proponent lists several potential sources of funding such as the Programa de Bosques and 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: Calificación de acuerdo a las cifras que presentan.

Evidence B: Yes. The Communal Reserve co-management approach may be powerful to achieve conservation.

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:* 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Se los propone. Son generales, podrán identificarse mejor.

Evidence B: There is acceptable alignment.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Existen varios elementos de la propuesta que pueden ser potencialmente realizables y que darán sostenibilidad a acciones y financiamiento futuro.

Evidence B: The proponent aims to achieve financial sustainability, this should be better spelled out.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Se explica en la propuesta y en general lo considero apropiada la vinculación con los establecido en las prioridades nacionales. Hay que tomar en cuenta que es central lo de potenciar las formas de coadministración para mejorar las alianzas pero además avanzar en los derechos de los pueblos indígenas.

Evidence B: Yes, there are acceptable statements about the contributions.

D) Demonstrated gender mainstreaming in all activities.

10. Does the EoI provide a clear and robust approach to gender mainstreaming?

Scoring:

- Gender mainstreaming approach is absent;
- Gender mainstreaming approach is weak;
- Gender mainstreaming approach is moderately thought through (if there are a few activities as 'add ons');
- Significant and well-thought through approach to gender mainstreaming

Reviewer A: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: En el acápite de gender mainstreaming está explícito el tema y se desarrollan algunas propuestas adecuadas. Sin embargo, en el diseño de la propuesta (resultados y actividades) no se menciona el tema ni como se va a abordar. Esto conlleva un riesgo importante al no haber sido incorporado técnicamente. Se sugiere revisar el contenido del proyecto e integrar las acciones que proponen (y que son adecuadas) en los resultados para poder monitorear y generar cambios durante la implementación del proyecto.

Evidence B: This element should be presented in more convincing detail.

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: 2/5 *Reviewer B:* 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: El potencial tiene que ver con avanzar en mejorar las formas de implementación de la gestión y avanzar en los derechos de los pueblos indígenas. No hay actividades innovadoras.

Evidence B: This project targets a few communal reserves. If successful, the lessons may be applied in other reserves.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 25/40

Performance of Eol 391 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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Es la ANECAP la principal instancia con sus filiales y en consorcio con DRIS.

Evidence B: The cover page states that ANECAP is the proponent but the contact person is someone from an NGO (DRIS-Peru).
Need to clarify the role of the NGO.

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: Hay un liderazgo de ANECAP. Este es una organizaci3n indigena a nivel nacional que aglutina a los ejecutores de contrato. Es una instancia con liderazgo sobre este tipo de contratos con el estado.

Evidence B: ANECAP has demonstrated leadership on the ground.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Idem texto anterior.

Evidence B: The proponent has strong ties with grassroots indigenous organizations.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: La capacidad de alcanzar los resultados está sujeta a una revisión de la propuesta. Los resultados son muy amplios y ello muestra una debilidad para establecer el alcance real de la implementación del proyecto. Creo que puede mejorarse.

Evidence B: The proponent states that they and the NGO DRIS have experience with GEF.

E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the Eol 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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Se presentan varias cifras sobre la ANECAP y sobre DRIS pero el rango máximo anual que mencionan es de USD 250.,000. Los valores de los proyectos son confusos.

Evidence B: This element needs to be explored further.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Se informa de la experiencia de implementacion de proyectos GEF pero la justificación le falta sustento.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 391 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

