

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 400

Organization: AIDSESEP

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
400	Andes/Amazon	Peru	22	34	29	85
400	Andes/Amazon	Peru	22	18	16	56

Performance of Eol 400 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 Peruvian Amazon is shaped by forests, different types of reserves and ecosystems. They have an important role in the survival of Indigenous Peoples of humanity and the preservation of biodiversity (Mother Earth)

Evidence B: The area of the project is all the Peruvian Amazon region, this is why the score is high. However, the project may be too broad in geographical scope.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: They have several ongoing projects aimed at the mitigation of the climatic change, the same as they can make adjustments and / or negotiations various local and national level to achieve full implementation of agreements on Climatic Change.

Evidence B: Yes, all the Peruvian Amazon is important for climate mitigation. Again, the scope of this project may be too broad.

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: AIDASEP is an indigenous organization coform by several regional organizations, communities and partners including women. If embargo The implementation of projects with donors In yet have to have the authorization of national authorities and indigenous men are those who come to the political / economic power

Evidence B: The project aims to cover all areas where indigenous people live. Some of those territories are not fully under their control, they may be under the Peruvian Protected Area Agency purview.

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The project clearly explains the cultural significance of the area of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, the importance of each of ecosystems for life and for the practice of indÃgena spirituality and indigenous ancestral knowledge.

Evidence B: Because the area is so broad, the statements on cultural significance are broad as well.

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: There is a long list of risks in the area to extractive activities, excessive felling of trees, illegal hunting and fishing, etc., activities that endanger the existence of the PICL and holistic conservation of various ecosystems and niches ecológicos of the protected areas and sacred sites. Because the pandemic risks are shortages of food and water and no practice and enjoyment of the collective rights of indigenous peoples. the life of the child is put at high risk as, women and elderly

Evidence B: Some areas suffer more stress, especially those in frontier regions. There are many in remote areas that face fewer threats.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: As PICL know the collective rights at national and international level, however in The implementation of projects need to have the endorsement and recognition of IP as owners and rights holders, as beings capable and responsible for deciding its future within the framework of self-determination, consultation, free, prior and informed consent, right to the fair and equitable sharing of benefits and the right to veto among others

Evidence B: There are many laws and regulations, but those need to be improved. Also, those that do exist need to be effectively implemented.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: In Peru there are some laws that support the conservation of some areas in the Amazon and the government has shown interest in working with PI. While laws may not provide adequate budget and regulatory policies they will be only laws and paper. There should be created and cultivated trust between the government and PI

Evidence B: Evidence shows that some agencies in the Peruvian government do support IPLC-led conservation where other agencies see them as an obstacle for progress.

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: The document can be seen that some projects were implemented beyond the pilot phase with the support of tea technicians and community teams. The inclusion of women will be required in future programs and activities

Evidence B: The project highlights relatively successful projects in the Northern Peruvian Amazon (Alto Mayo) and in Southeastern Peru (Amarakaeri). Those experiences may be scaled up.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: AIDESEP manages and runs the same time projects in various branches and regions apoyando complementarily in PI relevant projects on conservation, biodiversity and climatic change, empowerment of indigenous peoples and safety of life and PI the existence of biodiversity and ecosystems

Evidence B: The project provides information about 7 projects that could be complementary for the one proposed here.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 400 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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The proposal intends to work issues affecting IP, their lands, territories, waters and resources in accordance with the objectives and areas of Incluyente Conservation Initiative such as biodiversity, climate change, degradation of land, etc. . Further includes the participation of women, it is expected to be full and effective

Evidence B: The project is broad and therefore partially aligned.

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: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Objectives and achievements in climate change activities, safeguards, community education, participation in international meetings. etc. They're clearly defined. It will be important for continuous monitoring to ensure the embodiment of proposed activities on time and with social actors and technicians necessary resources tÃ©

Evidence B: There are 5 objectives in the project. Three of them are relatively explained while two are only mentioned. There is no clear theory of change nor focus to this project.

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 knows the serious challenges that has its region in terms of loss of the biodiversity, the negative consequences of the climatic change, which proposes clear objectives for the expected results

Evidence B: There is not enough detail to assess this question. Main feedback is for the proponents to focus on one or two things in order to have a larger impact.

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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: As they have developed different types of projects with various partners and communities under a good administration of the economic resources of ICI supplemented by other sources if the proposed activities were achieved

Evidence B: There are too many objectives and to do all of them properly it would be too expensive.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;

- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The paper outlined some concrete initiatives at national level for the continuation of the planned activities, as well as donor funds

Evidence B: Most of the sources of co-financing is in-kind.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: They will be substantial benefits in terms of real and land. No data on benefits in terms of marine areas

Evidence B: If all the Peruvian Amazon region is protected and effectively managed, yes the impact would be transformational. However, there is not a clear path to that end.

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: Proposes the estimation of protected areas and indigenous biocultural territories and areas of conservation administered by PICL, as well as the restoration of land

Evidence B: There are statements in this direction that do not contain enough detail.

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: AIDSESEP has experience in the execution of projects not as long, proposed partners to help her continue with the activities proposed medium-term

Evidence B: The project is too general.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The organization HATH aware of environmental and social justice problematic affecting PICL therefore projects aimed at the attention and resolution of these problems at local, national and international level

Evidence B: There is an effort in the text to build on national priorities.

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: Mentioned working with indigenous women in a specific activity and the creation of a document speaks of including women in the various activities, have to be more specific in terms of participation

Evidence B: It seems that there is a gender perspective well established in the proponent's approach.

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: The organization knows what the current problems affecting PICL and the environment therefore propose activities to overcome those problems to the benefit of PI and the same Mother Nature

Evidence B: For those activities where there is more detail, yes- there is a transformative potential.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 34/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/40

Average Total Score: 26/40

Performance of Eol 400 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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Indígena is an organization with partners from various regions and indigenous communities. Participate only as AIDASEP in ICI

Evidence B: AIDASEP is a national-level indigenous organization.

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: It is an organization with forty years of work for the benefit of PICL and the environment

Evidence B: Yes, according to the references presented for other projects.

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: 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: It has local, national and international partners, Indigenous and non-Indigenous to support and strengthen the work of AIDSESEP

Evidence B: AIDSESEP does not specify what other base organizations would have a clear role in this project.

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: They have not had the opportunity to work with GEF projects, however have extensive experience gained with other projects with donors

Evidence B: There is no evidence in the text that there is high capacity in AIDSESEP to carry out this complex and broad project.

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: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Its annual budget exceeds a million dollars and will always have the support of donors from various countries

Evidence B: AIDSESEP recently faced very public challenges in working with Rainforest Foundation Norway. Independent and transparent management could be an issue.

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: NA/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: He has knowledge and understanding of the scope of safeguards for the survival of indigenous and traditional knowledge

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 400 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

