

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 184

Organization: Pueblo Shuar Arutam

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
184	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	22	20	19	61
184	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	25	27	21	73

Performance of Eol 184 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: Ecuadorian Amazon, particularly Bosque Montano Amazónico

Evidence B: Condor mountain range is characterized as one of the most biodiverse areas in America.

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: According to Map

Evidence B: NA

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: It is a territory managed by the Shuar people as territorial constituency. Has limitations as elsewhere in the region, in this case in Ecuadorian law, the law of prior consultation for instance.

Evidence B: There is a strong management and control of the territory by the Arutam Shuar, in the form of six associations in the territory.

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 clearly it explains the importance of the territory of indigenous and self-governance, their governments, and their life plans.

Evidence B: Clear description of the cultural significance of the site, both in Ecuador and in Peru continuity.

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: This area has high threats to be in an important area of biodiversity. In particular the threat of mining.

Evidence B: The threats described (metal mining) placed the territory in a highly dangerous situation for biodiversity as well as, more human groups even when threats are backed by the state.

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: Will feature aspects of recognition policy level, however, there are particular gaps in their implementation, such as the law of prior consultation and which in the case of Ecuador is not binding.

Evidence B: a regulatory framework and favorable policy is found, but government support is still limited.

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: If according to the explanation and articulation it is done with local governments.

Evidence B: A limited government support for investment pressures in the area.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There are several that are important. They talk about the forest project partner and Proamazonia. Not many are evident in recent years.

Evidence B: The information provided is limited to the description of the adoption of Life Plans since 2006

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: It relates to the Socio Bosque project and take it as a potential contribution as co-financing. And also what is being done with local governments within PDOTs.

Evidence B: Government initiatives and Sociobosque Proamazonía perfectly articulated programs with conservation purposes ICI


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 23.5/30

Performance of Eol 184 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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: It focuses on strengthening life plans, governance of their territory and resilience to the situation of the COVID 19. I think particularly focuses on strengthening its governance in a proper way.

Evidence B: The opportunity seems very appropriate, because of the status of preparation of development plans and ongoing local management by local governments in the territory

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: The components of the proposal are very suitable. However the design regarding how to achieve them in relation to the results framework and activities needs to be revised. Stirrup leathers seems to me to have excellent elements, however the joint to achieve them is not clear. It may request a review and supplement to strengthen the proposal. The list of activities are very interesting.

Evidence B: greater specificity of the specific actions contemplated specifically for biodiversity conservation is necessary. It seems very clear actions concerning usage for any medicines, tourism and sustainable production, but it is necessary to define clearly what actions will contribute directly to the conservation of biodiversity without the risks associated with other proposed actions.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: It is unclear how they will do, although there is a relationship quite logical what arose to address threats.

Evidence B: This should also be demonstrated, it is not observed clearly in the proposal.

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: The design of the framework of results-activities is unclear and therefore difficult to give an answer at this point; however, the issues raised would be achieved by what is in the amaranth of the budget.

Evidence B: It is advisable to exhaustively detail the actions involved in the plan of life of the Shuar communities.

5. Does the Eol include significant and concrete sources of co-financing?

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Posed to co-finance medium-term budget and potential socio-Forest shares with local governments.

Evidence B: Considered sources indicate a strong dependence on government programs.

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: According to the matrix they have spoken of 230,000 corresponding to the Shuar territory Arutam.

Evidence B: 230,000 have

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: If they are right, but difficult to be evaluated for sure by the weakness of the design of the framework of results-activities.

Evidence B: Cultural indicators proposed actions are not necessarily correlate well identified.

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: Their approaches are a medium-term vision. associated projects may arise as partner forest to 2020 and potential investments by the ProAmazonia GADs Project.

Evidence B: The proposed actions may involve higher risks for biodiversity conservation, although it can mean profits in the short and medium term. There is no analysis of this situation in the EoI.

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: According to the description itself.

Evidence B: EOI is perfectly aligned within national environmental priorities.

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: In justification of the question 15 it is properly stated. However, no actions in design. In this regard it is essential technical integration so it can be executed.

Evidence B: The participation of women among the Shuar communities is one of its strengths.

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: If done generally strengthening indigenous governance in that territory effectively it is to achieve long-scale strengthening of the territorial rights of these peoples. But I do not see innovative activities.

Evidence B: The potential seems to depend on strong support from the state.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/40

Average Total Score: 23.5/40

Performance of Eol 184 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: It is indeed the Shuar people Arutam and their associations.

Evidence B: To the extent that rests on an initiative proposed plan of life guided by the Achuar associations and communities of the mountain range of the Condor

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: It has an important history of this organization. Initiatives are listed, yet there are not many in the últimos years. the leadership of partner forest management as an important element mentioned.

Evidence B: The project demonstrates the efforts of the Shuar communities in the territory.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: If among the communities of the Shuar people, but they are mentioning actions of integration with other organizational forms of the state such as GADs.

Evidence B: The proposal rests on strong support from government counterparts, as proven by initiatives such as Socio Bosque.

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: They are mentioned, but they should be revised to better argue as would handle it.

Evidence B: sufficient evidence is provided in this line.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: They have existosas experiences, however is unclear. They could surely do as they have done with forest and partner for some years, but would need support GEF funds.

*Evidence B:*The evidence provided shows that the organization could proponent require strong administrative support.

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: They have different experiences but not with GEF funds.

*Evidence B:*In the opinion, it has been part of the GEF initiatives.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 184 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

