

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 236

Organization: COSHIKOX y aliados

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
236	Andes/Amazon	Peru	20	24	18	62
236	Andes/Amazon	Peru	23	31	22	76

Performance of Eol 236 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 area is high biodiversity and has the important presence TCEs of indigenous peoples Amazon

*Evidence B:* This is an area in the Peruvian Amazon, with significant biodiversity resources. The areas inhabited by indigenous peoples significantly conserve the environment, as is the case of the land.

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:* Key areas for environmental mitigation forests and deforestation under strong pressure for agricultural development

*Evidence B:* High concentration of carbon in the biomass and soil region. The areas containing large amounts of unrecoverable carbon may warrant different strategies of conservation .

### 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:* In the area there are recognized territories and ways of IPLC own government, despite the gaps in conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are evident.

*Evidence B:* The area is under IPLC governance systems, yet not indigenous territory is fully demarcated, overlapping part of the territory with conservation unit and the devastation by different sectors.

#### 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: 0/2 Reviewer B: 2/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* The design of territory of this people goes beyond the concept of territorial space, including the way of life of the indigenous people to define the territory. There are specific references to the ceramics of this people, which is especially valued for its artistic expression and the resources for their manufacture are related to the territory. The identity of future generations is related to the territory and its resources.

#### 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: 3/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* Deforestation rates and pressures mining and monocultures are evident, the project should emphasize how to do better territorial defense and promote the development of communities

*Evidence B:* The economido model region represents threats to indigenous land, to be a model based on the example of the devastation illegal logging, the agribusiness exploring the palm oil, mining, exploration recuros water, petrolóleo and gas highways. Peru is a country where the devastation is too high.

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:* Rights are recognized, however conservation approaches are very redicidos in promoting cultural systems management and sustainable use. Importantly own livelihoods of communities

*Evidence B:* The country recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples, but not all of the territory is demarcated, weakness in the protection of indigenous lands and environmental conservation.

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:* Communities on the one hand integrate AP co-management model, however is richer their own territorial defense strategy is key in levels of biodiversity conservation, it will be necessary to identify and strengthen them.

*Evidence B:* In 2018, indigenous communities were officially believe the state for monitoreo, Surveillance and control forest it was eliminated the devastation of their lands. These activities were recognized by the UN in 2019, receiving the United Nations Program of Equatorial Award for Development (UNDP).

## 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Targeted efforts by the community as formal projects are proof of being limited, however are making efforts to strengthen

*Evidence B:* They are implemented ativedes monitoring and surveillance of the territory. With support from the Foundation Rainforte are being developed actions to monitor the territory, including using drones. In 2019, received the United Nations Program of Equatorial Award for Development (UNDP).

## 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 is evidence of small efforts will be necessary to explore other available resources and indigenous efforts from the various forms of community organization

*Evidence B:* The main co-financiers of the country (NICFI Moore Foundation among others) were not shown between the institutions, which finance activities of this institution. There is cooperation with NGOs supporting activities in the EEA monitoring, surveillance and communication.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 21.5/30

Performance of Eol 236 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 is important to deepen land management, life plans and how to strengthen governance of IPLC for territorial defense

*Evidence B:* The project strengthens the governance of the indigenous people of the territory and improves the protection of biodiversity.

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:* May be required detail macro actions staged in the first instance and then detail how the objectives

*Evidence B:* The project predict perform the refloresmento and wild conservation and produce not maderavaeis products. It aims to reconcile the economic with the preservation. He missed provide further information as will enable the economic and environmental sustentabiliade.

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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* It is necessary to deepen the threats on biodiversity will be addressed from the project, especially in the context of governance of tenure and protection of territorialidad

*Evidence B:* The institution has developed initiatives aimed at protection of the territory and forest conservation. In any case it will be necessary to government action to prevent intrusions and protect the lands and natural riquezas.

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:* more details of activities required, providing deep collective processes of planning and development of life plans

*Evidence B:* It is a large territory and the value of the investment is reasonable to develop the proposed activities.

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

*Reviewer A: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 1/3**

*Evidence A:* NA



*Evidence B:* Apresenado was as significant for concrete sources and grants co-financing Lush Charit and direct contributions of the Shipibo Conibo Center and has future support of Interethnic Association for the Development de la Amazonia Peruana AIDSESEP.

**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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* Is an area with an ambitious and strategic spatial impact, the impact can exceed 1 M ha.

*Evidence B:* The entire territory of the autonomous governance political project is 2,445,603.68 ha. The area titled communities is 600,516.75 ha.

**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:* more details of the expected scope and indicators is required

*Evidence B:* The dodelo that inspires the lifestyle is not individualistic, is collective and is connected with the reciprocal practices - the minagas or akinananti, guided by the spiritual understanding of ecology. It includes social balance with the sustainable use of resources.

**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: 2/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* sustainability impacts are anticipated, without being deepened

*Evidence B:* The project is considered as seed investment. It is expected that from the functioning of the cooperative interested indigenous people be able to make investments made with funds from the sale of products of the indigenous people.

### 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Challenges from the IPLC, are not necessarily well-defined national policies,

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities align with Peru Action Plan, specifically with the Capability autoevaluación Proyecto Nacionales en el Perú para la Gestión del Medio Global Environment Facility, which includes the participation of indigenous peoples in this program.

### 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:* It requires a greater depth of gender impacts and indicators pursued

*Evidence B:* Predicting the empowerment of indigenous women and reconheciento such as having knowledge of ancient medicine.

### 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:* The goals of the project can demonstrate the cultural value in the defense of the territory and sustainable uses, alternative uses based on customary uses

*Evidence B:* Considering the experience of the bidder in the area of monitoring and conservation of the territory and the sustainability of community activities to be undertaken, the project can serve as an example and be applied on a large scale.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 31/40

Average Total Score: 27.5/40

Performance of Eol 236 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: NA*

*Evidence B:* It is a partnership that involved the leadership of the indigenous organization with technical support from NGO partner. Whereas the reiteration project mentions autonomy the interested indigenous people, it is assumed that it is increasing the capacity of indigenous people in the medium and long term.

### 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:* It should profundizar in how it develops from a working group natural leadership and traditional community authorities

*Evidence B:* The institution has been developing important activities on the subject of the proposed area. This is a local organization interested indigenous people.

### 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: 5/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* There are partnerships with various forms of organization of the IPLC.

*Evidence B:* The organization develops activities with other organizations proprio people, including the network of indigenous communicators, cooperative this people.

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: 5/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Clearly IPLC is an organization that is under development, will require support well-defined goals in financial management, planning and implementation monitoring.

*Evidence B:* The organization has the ability to theme conversation, so much that has been awarded by UNDP. The organization has previous experience with the GEF,

## 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: 0/6 Reviewer B: NA/6*

**Average: 0/6**

*Evidence A:* will require support for the scale of funding

*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: 0/2 Reviewer B: 2/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* Does not have

*Evidence B:*The organization has received funding from the GEF.

### Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

**Average Total Score: 20/30**

Performance of Eol 236 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

