

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 278

Organization: CENTRAL ASHANINKA DEL RIO ENE

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Alejandro Herrera	278	Andes/Amazon	Peru	23	31	24	78
Paulo Celso de Oliveira	278	Andes/Amazon	Peru	24	19	16	59

Performance of Eol 278 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The territory of the project is of great importance for its biodiversity and current fragility

Evidence B: Important biodiversity area of the Andes recognized internationally. Even com endemics.

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: NA

Evidence B: Area with high tons of soil carbon and biomass. Areas containing large amounts of carbon irretrievable can justify different conservation strategies.

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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The territory appears to be under significant influence of CARE and its partner organizations, although very exposed to the intervention of external groups

Evidence B: In 2009, the Central Ashaninka of the Ene River consulted all the Ashaninka communities tube results in Kametsa Asaike (Good Living). In 2015, the CARE performed again as consultation results were bred new communal statutes, dishess which include the participation of indigenous liderscos in territorial surveillance.

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: The description provided insufficient evidence or cultural indicators presents itself such as to estimate its relevance. However, the importance of the Ashaninka people in the Amazon territory is well known.

Evidence B: The Kametsa Asaike (Good Living), expectations related between maintaining tradition and opt for new practices such as the commitment to schooling, medical care in the clinics, and above all, the need production for a sale in the market. CARE's work has focused sigueindo the Kametsa Asaike, which Inclui schools and bilingual intercultural approach and environmental conservation.

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: It certainly is a very large area exposed to potential threats and external pressures well described in the proposal. The mention of recent large intervention trials not Ashaninka is an important example of the dangers to which the territory is exposed regularly.

Evidence B: Coca cultivation by migrants from other areas close to the Ashaninka communities land. Some communities are exposing their land to legal and illegal logging in exchange for goods and cash

D) Opportunities for ICI results - including enabling policy conditions, positive government support and presence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up.

6. Are enabling policy conditions in place for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area?

Scoring:

- Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize limited rights for IPLCs over their lands and/or resources;
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Evidence about the TDC mechanism allows a positive evaluation in policy implementation

Evidence B: Reconece it states the rights of indigenous peoples and there are policies to promote forest conservation. Exemplo The National Forest Conservation Program for Climate Change Mitigation (Forest Program) of the Ministry of the Environment (MINAM).

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: As mentioned, the Conditional Direct Transfers (TDC) seem a positive step. However, no concrete evidence of links is observed with local governments

Evidence B: Conservation agreements with indigenous communities access the Conditional Direct transfer mechanism (TDC) that provide economic incentives, as well as technical assistance.

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: Apparently, there are now a small number of recent projects in operation, although in the recent past there were projects with important financings.

Evidence B: The work done Kemito Jan has been recognized internationally by the United Nations Development Program, through the Equator Prize, as a sustainable business model that puts at the center of communities and their forests.

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: Apparently, there are few initiatives, and these rather focused on the production-trade area

Evidence B: Bono Development Impact Kemito Jan - the project results 1 - increasing productivity in cocoa farms; 2. Implementation of 200ha of agroforestry systems on existing farms. 3. Reduction of deforestation in five communities


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 23.5/30

Performance of Eol 278 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposed approach and actions to seem remarkably well aligned with issues of governance of the territory, conservation and sustainable management of natural resources.

Evidence B: Ashaninka territory protection, preserving and recovering forests and apyo deste the governance of indigenous people.

2. Does the EoI present a clear and convincing set of activities and results?

Scoring:

- The objectives and approach for this project lack clarity and cohesion, and/or do not appear to be realistic for the context;
- Activities & results defined but logic (Theory of Change) is incomplete;
- Activities and results are well-defined and cohesive but some aspects require clarification;
- The project has clear objectives and a cohesive approach with relevant activities for the context and timeline

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: It is advisable to consider and analyze how the relationship between threats regarding the occupation of land-shares for land titling-relationships with local and national governments will articulate

Evidence B: Activities and results are well defined, but it is necessary to better consider the impacts of the communities involved in forest clearing.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The organization looks solid and has important allies.

Evidence B: Activities and results are well defined, but it is necessary to consider better external pressures on indigenous territory, the role of government and justice institutions for the protection of the territory and the preservation of the environment, not least because the communities are involved in illegal logging.

4. Are the activities achievable within a \$500,000 to \$2,000,000 USD budget range in a period of 5 years of project execution?

Scoring:

- Activities/results not aligned with Eol range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: It is perfectly possible to achieve the results proposed for this project with the proposed financing, with good financial management.

Evidence B: Given that it is a local project, activities can be designed within this budget.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Their current budgets seem much diminished compared to those received a few years ago.

Evidence B: If, with Bono Project Development Impact Kemito Jan and the project, which result:

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: I consider that the figures provided by CARE require further review

Evidence B: Estimated area of restored land (Hectares) 1,000. Estimated area of landscapes / territories with improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares) Around 230,000 hectares of indigenous territories. Total area under improved management (Hectares) 231,000

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There is agreement among the indicators proposed

Evidence B: Sostenibilidad economic production of cocoa and coffee through Kemito Jan conservation of forests and indigenous culture.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: More information is required to determine the strengths of the project on sustainability

Evidence B: The project garantizará the conservation of the territory and conservation of biodiversidad during its existence, the sustentabilid peo no long prazo

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposal articulates well with the national strategies described

Evidence B: The project is about the National Biodiversity Strategy, which increase the contribution of biodiversity to national development and the Meta: 2021 have been worth five ecosystem services, ensuring the integrity of ecosystems and respect for indigenous peoples involved

D) Demonstrated gender mainstreaming in all activities.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: I think the focus on gender is placed more on participation and strengthening Ashaninka women in agricultural production of certain goods to market, and some political participation. Further analysis of gender relations can not appreciate inside Ashaninka society

Evidence B: There will be the empowerment of women in the project, but it is unclear whether there will be a stage.

exclusive spaces for training and discussion for women at the community level and at the level of indigenous organizations will be created. The project will also invest in training women in managing family finances, for the best use of economic resources, linking these with family priorities based on a baseline and analysis of socioeconomic gaps.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: No doubt the Indian Systems Monitoring and Self-Defense Committees are a key element in controlling the territory and biodiversity conservation

Evidence B: The fact that there are communities involved in illegal logging threatens the sustainability of the project and its multiplication.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 31/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/40

Average Total Score: 25/40

Performance of Eol 278 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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The project will be led by the indigenous organization and others in the territory with the support of an 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: The fact that Jan Kemito appears as a central component of this proposal suggests central leadership of CARE.

Evidence B: The proponent of the project has experience with issues of territorial governance, education and megaprojects and has leadership 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: NA

Evidence B: Partnerships with the Association of productores Kemito Jan and Rainforest Foundation UK

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: CARE has no direct experience with CARE, but has had experience with international conventions

Evidence B: The proponent has already developed other projects, even with the support of the European Union, including the 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: NA/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: CARE has executed projects close to one million euros in the recent past

*Evidence B:*Project: Organic cocoa production in the Peruvian Amazon: sustainable livelihoods for indigenous families, Dración: 2010-2013, budget: £ 750,000 Scale ongoing projects and \$ 1,000 to \$ 10,000 a year Funding for the organization comes from at least three sources and the external audits are performed annually.

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: RFFUK support CARE has allowed him to access experiences with international standards

*Evidence B:*The proponent has experience with GEF, but with fraca explicción.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 278 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

