

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 253

Organization: ASOCIACIÓN DE AUTORIDADES ARHUACAS DE LA SIERRA NEVADA
ASO-CIT

Eol Metadata

| Eol | Geography | state | Section 1 | Section 2 | Section 3 | Total |
|-----|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| 253 | Andes/Amazon | Colombia | 24 | 26 | 25 | 75 |
| 253 | Andes/Amazon | Colombia | 21 | 22 | 25 | 68 |

Performance of Eol 253 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: some relevant aspects How is the snow mountain highest in the coastal world and has key strategic ecosystems at both global and national level mentioned.

Evidence B: Trata-se de uma região com diferentes ecossistemas com grandes níveis de biodiversidade e que produz água.

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: Moderate 50 to 70 as viewer, however it is important to note that this is a key area for Colombia, and some areas have strategic ecosystems threatened with extinction

Evidence B: Presença de contidade média de carbono no solo e biomassa.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Although there is an autonomous management, there are many threats of governance for indigenous peoples and the state still has differences in visions of development for this area.

Evidence B: Os quatro povos indígenas que habitam a região alta de Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (SNSM) realizam a governança de seus territórios de acordo com suas próprias normas.

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: There is a basic explanation, no details are given that more political aspects of the organization shows. However clear elements are expressed saw the importance of both a local and global context

Evidence B: Os quatro povos ancestrais que habitam a SNSM de acordo considera a partir de suas visões que SNSM é o coração do mundo e é seu dever a partir de seu mandato de origen, proteger el territorio ancestral conservando e cuidando do ecosistema. A SNSM representa um territorio sagrado destinado, desde a origen de da criação, para preservar o equilibrio entre los hombres, a naturaleza e o universo.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The catchment areas of the detail area are at high pressures and threats, in addition to the proposals clearly state historical context of this indigenous people in the struggle to consolidate its territory

Evidence B: A grande agricultura de, café, banana, palma africana y milho transformaram uma de 80.000 hectáreas da região baixa e média da SNSM. As atividades agrícolas te trazido como consecuencia o corte de madeira e incendio das florestas, desvios de rios e arroios, erosão, contaminação de solos e fontes de águas. Os grandes projetos (portos marítimos exploração de gás e petróleo e infraestrutura de telecomunicação, mineração ilegal e legal, turismo pouco sustentável, ameaçam a biodiversidade e a integridade étnica e territorial de Serra Nevada.

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: Yes, the document mentions among others the black line project, commitments within the national development plan etc.

Evidence B: Os povos indígenas tem o reconhecimento do governo nacional desenvolvem importante papel na conservação.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There is specific area in support of the ANT (National Lands Agency), to strengthen collective land tenure in this area. Likewise, the Council is leading the Tayrona National Commission on Indigenous territories. However, the current government shows no more will to advance national conservation initiatives led by indigenous peoples

Evidence B: O governo da Colômbia através do Ministério do meio Ambiente, Ministério do Interior e Ministério da Cultura tem reconhecido e apoiado a governança indígena do território. Em 2017 através do diálogo com os quatro povos de Serra Nevada de Santa Marta, foram estabelecidos diferentes acordos direcionados a um modelo de desenvolvimento econômico sustentável e entre os pontos acordados incluiu a construção de um protocolo de consulta prévia aos povos indígenas.

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:* 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There are several initiatives in complementary implementation by the example the area is already written as a Tica, there are plans black or TBM line called Environmental and Traditional lace Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, both are initiatives that are led by IPLC

Evidence B: Há diversas experiências exitosas executadas pela proponente, que inclui a gestão da área, criação de áreas culturais, preservação da biodiversidade e sítios sagrados.

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: There are several NGO projects that develop in the area and they are complementary, however there is no clarity as articulate

Evidence B: Sim, há diversos projetos relevantes que fornecem apoio complementar liderado pelo IPCL, por exemplo o projeto "Fortalecimiento gobernanza Pueblo Arhuaco SNSM y conservación biodiversidad SNSM, apoiado pela Fundação Ford.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 253 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 project focuses on strengthening traditional structures of governance around sustainable production and conservation of the territory also is intended and estruturado by an indigenous organization with longstanding indigenous representation

Evidence B: Sim, a proposta trata do fortalecimento da governança própria dos povos indígenas sobre seus territórios, a conservação da biodiversidade e a sustentação econômica das comunidades.

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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: There are results and activities, but writing them is confusing in parts because it is written partly in English and partly in Spanish

Evidence B: Existe um conjunto claro de atividades a serem desenvolvidas, mas falta definir como elas seriam distribuídas nas comunidades.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: With the proposed activities is achieved by responding to specific threats to the work area

Evidence B: O projeto contribuirá apresentando um modelo economico que fortaleça a governança tradicional e a conservação da biodiversidade, diferente do atual modelo excludente e predatório.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: However, the wording of the proposal is unclear is necessary to revise the script repeatedly, plus it is written in English and Spanish

Evidence B: As atividades são alcançáveis de acordo com esses valores de recursos.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: a list of possible iniciativas to articulate occur, but it is unclear co-financing of initiatives in this proposta

Evidence B: Diversas instituições que atuam na região tem o potencial de contribuir de forma concreta, como é o caso Global Wildlife Conservation, Dendrobatidae Nederland, ZGAP, various zoos from AZA, entre outras.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: 61,000 has of territories under different management modalities and management

Evidence B: Superfície total sob gestão melhorada (Hectáreas) 86,694ha 11 Estimated number of direct beneficiaries 11000 personas

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: indicators are proposed, but they are not robust enough to monitor the goals of the project in cultural terms, however this indigenous association being autonomous in its implementation could improve on variables such as governance and others.

Evidence B: Apresenta uma relação de indicadores, mas não ocorre a quantificação dos dados

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: There are allied institutions mentioned, but there is a clear exercise showing a sustainability plan of the proposed actions

Evidence B: Considera que a articulação com outros projetos desenvolvidos pelos povos indígenas e suas organizações poderá garantir a sustentabilidade a longo 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Apparently as shown can be articulated, but no direct clarity and explained

Evidence B: A iniciativa esta alinhada com a “Estrategia y Plan Acción Nacional en Biodiversidad (EPANB)”

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: This proposal being built entirely by indigenous peoples view thereof shown against the role of women in the actions, but no concrete strategies that promote them are exhibited. It should be chosen this component should be strengthened

Evidence B: A perspectiva de genero é tratada de forma transversal. Será apoiado a participação das mulheres indígenas no projeto, inclusive considerando que elas tem importante conhecimentos relacionados a sobrevivencia.

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: the direct impact zone proposal is presented in a specific area of the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, if it succeeds it would be a model to be applied in the other two sides of the mountains, where farmers and communities relate. Similarly to the be implemented by these two associations, the ASO-CIT proponent and the Tayrona Indigenous Council, implementation across the Sierra could be guaranteed

Evidence B: Tem o potencial para resultados de conservação considerando pre preve o fortalecimento da governança indígena, conservação e o desenvolvimento de atividades de sustentação economica.

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/40
Reviewer B Total Score: 22/40
Average Total Score: 24/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/40

Average Total Score: 24/40

EoIs


Geography Overall Percentile

Average Section 2

Andes/Amazon

253

| Category | Average Section 2 | Geography Overall Percentile |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Andes/Amazon | 20.0 | 0.00 |
| Andes/Amazon | 23.0 | 0.15 |
| Andes/Amazon | 24.0 | 0.05 |
| Andes/Amazon | 24.5 | 0.10 |
| Andes/Amazon | 25.0 | 0.02 |
| Andes/Amazon | 25.5 | 0.15 |
| Andes/Amazon | 26.0 | 0.20 |
| Andes/Amazon | 26.5 | 0.38 |
| Andes/Amazon | 27.0 | 0.18 |
| Andes/Amazon | 27.5 | 0.28 |
| Andes/Amazon | 28.0 | 0.65 |
| Andes/Amazon | 28.5 | 0.48 |
| Andes/Amazon | 29.0 | 0.58 |
| Andes/Amazon | 29.5 | 0.45 |
| Andes/Amazon | 30.0 | 0.42 |
| Andes/Amazon | 30.5 | 0.52 |
| Andes/Amazon | 31.0 | 0.40 |
| Andes/Amazon | 31.5 | 0.78 |
| Andes/Amazon | 32.0 | 0.78 |
| Andes/Amazon | 32.5 | 0.78 |
| Andes/Amazon | 33.0 | 0.62 |
| Andes/Amazon | 33.5 | 0.75 |
| Andes/Amazon | 34.0 | 0.75 |
| Andes/Amazon | 34.5 | 0.92 |
| Andes/Amazon | 35.0 | 0.95 |
| Andes/Amazon | 36.0 | 0.98 |
| Andes/Amazon | 37.0 | 1.00 |
| 253 | 22.0 | 0.28 |



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: This built and seeks a complete management by the indigenous organization Arhuaca and has the support of the indigenous council Tayrona, which is also an indigenous organization

Evidence B: A proposta foi apresentada por uma IPLC em parceria com outras instituições.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: In the specific area these two organizations are representing the IPCL have longstanding processes and are represented at the subnational and national levels

Evidence B: O proponente desenvolve projetos no território e coordena uma rede de organizações locais.

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: 3/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: They have direct representation at the local level, and have the support of the council Tayrona national organization

Evidence B: Sim, demonstra que tem parcerias com diversas organizações indígenas e ONGs.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Although an indigenous organization that has focused on governance issues, propose a number of NGOs, universities and other government institutions allied in their implementation

Evidence B: A proponente demonstrou que tem experiencia na execução de projeto.

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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The organization presents as an example a project to strengthen governance for more than 1 million euros, but has not managed GEF projects

Evidence B: A organização administra um orçamento acima de US \$ 200.000, realiza a auditoria externa anual e segue suas recomendações.

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: Specific has experience with donors such as USAID, UNDP and AECID, but gives no further explanation whether these processes handled safeguards, plus two did not mention them as examples in Table Project

Evidence B: A proponente não administrou recursos do GEF, mas já administrou projetos com recursos da USAID, UNDP y AECID (Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo)

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 253 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

