

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 393

Organization: Gran Familia Awá Binacional

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Carlos César Durigan	393	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	24	31	25	80
Claudio C. Maretti	393	Andes/Amazon	Ecuador	27	35	21	83

Performance of Eol 393 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: Yes, including a significant portion of different and relevant biomes and ecosystems, including KBAs and landscape of high importance

Evidence B: High level for species and a large KBA over the territory (although not so much intact forests).

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: Understand that, considering the Map of Irrecoverable Carbon, the region presents moderate relevance.

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: As presented in the proposal I understand the existing governance efforts and processes are in course, with significant evolution but need strengthening.

Evidence B: It is stated that the IP governance is there (besides relations with IPLC outside), but there is not full capacity to control the territory, particularly due to civil conflict in Colombia and governmental decisions over oil and minerals.

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: I understand the significance is well explained and the proposal shows well the relevance of this region to the ethnic group considered

Evidence B: So well stated that the EoI was clearly written by an expert (whom sometimes refer to the IPs as a third part).

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The proposal and material available shows a process of increasing of threats which includes changes of land use patterns and growing non-sustainable productions

Evidence B: Although the Cumulative Development Pressures presents a variation between very high and medium high, the presence of military, illegal and armed groups, as stated in the EoI, make it worse.

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: I understand that there is a very positive evolution in recognition, but a lack when considering land occupation by different ethnic groups.

Evidence B: It is stated that the IP governance is there (besides relations with IPLC outside), but there are governmental decisions over oil and minerals.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Considering the evolution of positive results presented during the last years, and policies established in both countries I believe some support exists, but it still demands a landing process of new policies and plans recently established

Evidence B: Apparently so...

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: I consider a strong process already existing providing good basis to succeed in terms of scaling up good results and initiatives.

Evidence B: There might be some more experiences, but more localised within the set of Awa territories, not at the scale proposed by the EoI.

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Yes, important initiatives establishing a strong and relevant basis to strengthen the local communities and organizations to lead a scaling up process based in conservation and participatory governance

Evidence B: NA

Average Total Score: 25.5/30



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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: I believe the proposal fits very well to ICI objectives, once including well connected objectives and activities.

Evidence B: EoI presents strong arguments for both nature conservation and IPs interests.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: Good presentation of activities and expected results, including updating and review of already constructed basis and promoting a good direction to scale up processes. One point not clear to me is which actions would be implementing to construct a bridge between the two countries involved? Considering the necessity to involve different national governments and their agencies. I believe is important to construct a clear objective to see how to construct synergy and cooperation between the countries.

Evidence B: NA

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: Once clarified how actions will includes construction of synergies between countries, I think would be better to evaluate how strong will be the project to face challenges listed.

*Evidence B:*As most projects usually are.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: I believe the proposal could succed with the range of investment, despite they left in blank the answer to question 17. Will be important to consider if will maintain this after review activities to include actions to promote sinergy between countries's agencies and policies

*Evidence B:*Probably... (Not answered...)

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: I think the proposal demonstrate a strong basis of additional support

Evidence B: Apparently.

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:* 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The total area presented is low. I don't understand well this low number, considering the total área proposed as geographic range for the project. Maybe they are underestimating the potential to achieve a bigger area of direct impacts.

Evidence B: NA

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: I understand the life plan pre-existing considers and is well based in cultural and livelihoods aspects and the proposal aims to provide better programatic and strategic perspective to strenght it

Evidence B: EoI presents very good connections.

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: I understand the proposal has an important line of activities which includes a management plan and financial plan implementation. However additional resources at long term is not presented.

Evidence B: NA

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: Very well presented in the proposal, a clear integration of actions to necessities established in all plans and priorities established at national scales.

Evidence B: NA

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: It is clear the understanding of necessity to promote a gender approach in the proposal.

Evidence B:NA

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Yes, but need a better understanding related to how to achieve a regional set of results, considering involvement of both countries.

*Evidence B:*NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 31/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 35/40

Average Total Score: 33/40

Performance of Eol 393 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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: I understand a strong leadership from the proponent organization

Evidence B: Considering as stated in the EoI.

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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: I understand in the proposal a strong leadership and indigenous organizations integrative work

Evidence B: NA

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The proposal presents a very well basis of integration and participation in execution. But felt that participation in design was limited to the two proponent.

Evidence B: NA

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: I agree they proponent has important and strong skills and experiences.

Evidence B: First we shall consider the partner organisation in the potential project management. Then, although mentioned some GEF related knowledge, they seems not to have experience on it.

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: Seems paradoxal, they present a very strong experience in manage funds and donations, but mention they don't have financial capacity (e.g. external audits lack of experience). I think is good to clarify this point.

Evidence B: More due to the combination of roles in the two organisations.

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 proposal just mention the donnors, not including in explanation safeguards and other standards

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 393 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

