

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 130

Organization: Fondo Para la Acción Ambiental y la Niñez – Fondo Acción

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
130	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	20	32	23	75
130	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	26	35	20	81

Performance of Eol 130 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: The Choco biogeographic region and the adjacent marine areas contain high biodiversity.

Evidence B: The area is coastal, with a portion of land, intertidal areas and a portion of close sea (with three sub-areas). Highest level for species (but land-based), some intact forests and few cases of KBAs partially included. Nevertheless, the Choco-Darien is consider a high level top priority ecoregion for conservation (not the highest, but high enough). The data offered are not enough detailed on the importance of local marine biology, but considering the proposal and the general knowledge, is at least of high enough importance.

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: Yes, high terrestrial and ocean carbon value.

Evidence B: The area is relatively narrowly defined, but there is some important strips for carbon, including mangroves.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The focus of the project is on protected areas that have some overlap with indigenous lands and are under co-management.

Evidence B: There is enough information to consider the area legally managed by IPLCs, combining local traditional communities (dominating in the proposal) with indigenous peoples (around), what is not completely clear is how effective this legal systems is 'de facto'. (The pre-project proposal mentions some difficulties in managing resources, such as in fisheries and timber exploitation, but the governance seems more important than most areas.)

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: The project proponent has shown MOUs with local organizations that have traditional roots, mainly, afro-descendants.

Evidence B: Important local traditional communities. (There is a tendency in considering indigenous peoples with high level of unique cultural significance, what I have not done here.)

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The document states threats from illegal logging, mining and illicit crops.

Evidence B: The proposal states a series of threats, but the “Cumulative Development Pressures” does not present such high level pressure in all the three sub-areas: a very limited portion with very high pressure, some parts with high and medium-high pressure and most of the declared area under medium-low or low pressures. Nevertheless, the areal distribution might not represent the pressures over the most important natural and cultural features.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Most IPLC areas have titles but there is room for improvement. Laws and regulations need to be better enforced.

Evidence B: Interesting context with local traditional communities with responsibility for natural resources. (There considerably less information for the local communities, as compared with indigenous peoples, in the sources of resources to support analysis.)

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: Yes, there is a regulatory framework favorable for the project.

Evidence B: Clear legislation and policy elements are indicated in the proposal. (Although there is relative lack of funding and effectiveness, this tends to usually happen, including in LAC and other developing regions.)

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: Fondo Accion has a few strong projects in the area, particularly La Minga.

Evidence B: There is a significant effort, but it does not seem enough IPLC-led yet.

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: Yes, this proposed project aligns well with La Minga.

Evidence B: There is a good strategy in place, within which the proposal would fit (although it does not seem enough IPLC-led yet).


Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30
Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30
Average Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

A scatter plot showing the relationship between 'Average Section 1' (X-axis) and 'Geography Overall Percentile' (Y-axis) for various EoIs. The X-axis ranges from 0 to 30, and the Y-axis ranges from 0.00 to 1.00. The plot features two data series: 'Andes/Amazon' represented by red open circles and '130' represented by a single green open circle. The 'Andes/Amazon' series shows a strong positive correlation, with points clustered along a diagonal path from approximately (16, 0.00) to (28, 1.00). The '130' series consists of a single point located at approximately (21.5, 0.53).

EoI	Average Section 1	Geography Overall Percentile
Andes/Amazon	16.0	0.00
Andes/Amazon	19.5	0.03
Andes/Amazon	20.0	0.05
Andes/Amazon	20.5	0.28
Andes/Amazon	21.0	0.22
Andes/Amazon	21.5	0.25
Andes/Amazon	21.8	0.20
Andes/Amazon	22.0	0.18
Andes/Amazon	22.2	0.28
Andes/Amazon	22.5	0.25
Andes/Amazon	22.8	0.15
Andes/Amazon	23.0	0.12
Andes/Amazon	23.2	0.62
Andes/Amazon	23.5	0.58
Andes/Amazon	23.8	0.48
Andes/Amazon	24.0	0.45
Andes/Amazon	24.2	0.65
Andes/Amazon	24.5	0.72
Andes/Amazon	24.8	0.75
Andes/Amazon	25.0	0.78
Andes/Amazon	25.2	0.75
Andes/Amazon	25.5	0.95
Andes/Amazon	25.8	0.98
Andes/Amazon	26.0	0.92
Andes/Amazon	26.5	1.00
130	21.5	0.53



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: Fondo Accions makes a strong case of the alliances with IPLCs.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: There are two sets of objectives that are well presented: improve local governance and improve the quality of life of local people through sustainable projects.

*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: The project proposes to develop economic alternatives to local people to minimize threats to the environment. However, there is a gap in addressing major threats that are caused by external forces.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: Yes, it is achievable, particularly if there is a focus on few communities.

*Evidence B:*NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Sources of funding mentioned include La Minga and some public sources. This section could be strengthened.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Yes, they are. But, this section could be more explicit.

*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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Yes. The diversity of communities are addressed in the document.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: This project builds on La Minga. Because there is a sustainable finance component, there is a framework for long-term benefits.

Evidence B: There is a clear long term vision, with good sustainable elements, but it is not so clear how much it is IPLC-led yet.

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: The project makes an adequate case for alignment.

Evidence B: (Despite the fact that, between legislation and stated policy and the real action and funding, there usually are considerable gaps, this happens in several other cases and countries, including in LAC and in other developing ones.)

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: The document explains how they will address gender issues.

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 . Success at the local level here can be scaled up elsewhere.

*Evidence B:*NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 35/40

Average Total Score: 33.5/40

Performance of Eol 130 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: The proponent is a Colombian NGO that has developed clear MOUs with IPLCs.

Evidence B: I am in doubt, really, between 2nd and 3rd score level: Both the general long term strategy and the pre-project proposal here presented seem strongly led by NGOs, although stating that the implementation shall be led by IPLCs.

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Yes, Fondo Accion has many years of working in the region with local organizations.

Evidence B: Again, I am in doubt, really, between 2nd and 3rd score level: The leading organisation (more a kind of trust) does not demonstrate enough on-ground leadership, but it mentions the associate organizations (IPLC ones and almost grassroots ones), which supposedly would have such leadership.

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: Fondo Accion presented evidence of strong partnerships.

Evidence B: See previous comments.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The proponent does have experience with GEF projects.

Evidence B: The leading organisation seems to have very good conditions to manage project funds (considering what is presented in the proposal), but does not demonstrate good implementing activities and managing natural resources enough capacity – although mentioning those would be responsibility of the associated organisations.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Yes, this organization shows compliance.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 21.5/30

Performance of Eol 130 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

