

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 205

Organization: Entidad Territorial Indígena Atun Wasi Iuiiai-AWAI-del Pueblo Inga de Colombia

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
205	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	24	32	26	82
205	Andes/Amazon	Colombia	27	34	22	83

Performance of Eol 205 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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The initiative proposed area is of exceptional significance for its territory, landscape and seascape. The region of the initiative is considered very important for biodiversity and bioculturalidad high international importance, the Laguna de la Cocha considered the lagoon freshwater largest in Colombia and declared as Wetlands International Ramsar, a region rich in wildlife and plants medicinal and given region is called the Colombian Massif and biological corridor of the Amazon. Colombian.

Evidence B: contains a Ramsar site; part of important amazon biological corridor and high level so bio diversity.

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: The initiative demonstrates in its document the importance of the region for the conservation of flora and fauna, medicinal plants, their freshwater and forest for future generations.

Evidence B: from irrecoverable carbon map

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: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The document shows a partial initiative governance system under peoples through guards.

Evidence B: 10 indigenous reservations under state law and indígenas que bajo las normas del and 95% as untitled ancestral lands but managed under cultural norms. The communities are consolidating a unique governance system

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 importance of the proposed area is of unique significance for indigenous peoples involved in the project. The unique relationship of indigenous peoples to their lands, territories and resources is evident. From a cultural point of view of the communities that inhabit the region, its territory has retained its own language (except the people Quillasinga), which allows them to be custodians of first order in knowledge and environmental authorities; known widely different medicinal plants and all rely on the plant commonly known as Yagé to strengthen spirituality and dialogue with non-human beings visible and invisible to those who are one family. Earth is considered by all a living being, mom.

Evidence B: This is an area that has been recovered by Indigenous peoples from a reality of conflict and critical to their cultural revitalization

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The region is in a negative impact actual risk to biodiversity and indigenous peoples. Oil drilling, mining, logging of forest for trade fine woods, establishment of drug trafficking and ranching, intensive spraying with glyphosate and strong contaminación with poisons, trash and different types of waste are the main scourges that during the last 50 years have affected the territories of the Wuasikamas.

Evidence B: Oil exploration, mining, indiscriminate cattle ranching and narcotics trafficking have been at the base of the ongoing threats. The communities have had to seek the protection of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposed area allows political conditions for indigenous peoples of the region can direct conservation. Several towns in the region demonstrate recognition of their rights by way of receipts with limited application. However, the document on Policy Guidelines and Strategies for Regional Sustainable Development of the Colombian Massif Vision 2018 and the Amazon (2016-2021) program allows the recognition of indigenous peoples of the region and their full and effective participation in the conservation.

Evidence B: Programa Visión Amazonía (2016-2021) promotes IPLC led conservation and the general area is of state importance for sustainable development

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The proposed area demonstrates an active support from the government to direct conservation indigenous peoples in the region. According to the tabular support resource there is legislation that promotes the rights of indigenous peoples. Similarly, the document Policy Guidelines and Strategies for Regional Sustainable Development of the Colombian Massif and the Vision 2018 Program Amazon are commitments the government for the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and even liderizando conservation.

Evidence B: Programa Visión Amazonía (2016-2021) promotes IPLC led conservation and the general area is of state importance for sustainable development

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: The document submitted by the interested demonstrates that there are successful conservation initiatives led by indigenous peoples in the proposed area that provide a base for expanding an experience of over 10 years.

Evidence B: The communities were able to recover their lands from the clutches of trafficking and implement initiatives that are biodiversity conservation friendly for which they have received awards. These serves as a good foundation

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: The document presented by the interested parties and support resource tabular show that there are other initiatives (major projects) that provide additional support for conservation led by indigenous peoples in geography.

Evidence B: 3 relevant projects are listed and the support of the Fundacion Kawsay


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/30

Average Total Score: 25.5/30

Performance of Eol 205 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 initiative presented by indigenous peoples reflects the proposed approach is well aligned with the overall objective of the ICI: Improve the efforts of Indigenous Peoples to manage land, water and natural resources to provide global environmental benefits

Evidence B: the project aims to consolidate governance; provide innovative technology for stewardship, and strengthen livelihood opportunities

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: EOL presents a clear and compelling set of activities and results. For example, the strengthening and consolidation of "Wuasikamas-Guardians of Life and Territory" will help indigenous peoples and peasant present in the Wetland International RAMSAR Lake Guamuez River Patia, Putumayo and Caqueta can retain so inclusive the unique biodiversity in the world present in this region through the implementation of a Governance Protocol Biocultural of the Territory.

Evidence B: the project aims to consolidate governance; provide innovative tools for stewardship and strengthen livelihood opportunities

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: The project (objectives and activities) helps to overcome the identified threats and to implement the necessary opportunities for conservation led by indigenous peoples. However, contributions to address threats and enabling conditions are slightly ambitious because there is a degree of recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples but implementation is limited.

Evidence B: The success of the communities to recover, protect and revitalize their earth friendly lifeways and livelihoods has relied on building collective engagement and creating alternative livelihoods to what narco-trafficking was provided. The project is contribution to consolidating life plans, providing new technologies for stewardship, revitalising culture and strengthening livelihood opportunities.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The document submitted by the interested demonstrates that activities can be achieved within a budget range of \$ 500,000 to \$ 2,000,000 USD over a period of 5 years of implementation of the project.

Evidence B: Similarly sized projects have been implemented

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: The Eol includes significant and specific sources of co-funding. However, it does not provide the exact number of significant sources.

Evidence B: Three relevant projects are listed and the commitment of communities and Suma Kawsay Foundation is indicated

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: Global environmental benefits are substantial and realistic estimates. For example, it is expected that at the end of the project the total area under improved management is 9,276,600 Hectares

Evidence B: according to table provided in question 12.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The paper presents the cultural and media life results of further contribute to the objectives of the project.

Evidence B: no livelihood indicators proposed

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: The document expresses his EoI provides a clear and solid for long-term sustainability to benefit biodiversity and indigenous peoples vision. However, notes that future funding will be constructed with the base of your project.

Evidence B: the consolidation of collective engagement by communities and geotourism are offered as strategies. While the future of tourism is under question given covid 19, in principle these two strategies are consistent with what has allowed communities to be successful thus far.

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: The document does not identify contributions to national priorities defined in NBSAPs and NDC. However, overall government support and participation of indigenous peoples in national priorities is much mentioned.

Evidence B: Esta iniciativa Wuasikamas está en armonía con 2 de las 6 metas establecidas por Colombia a 2030 a saber: 1) Biodiversidad, gestión de riesgo y suministro de servicios ecosistémicos: Se habrán controlado los principales motores de pérdida y degradación de bosques en el país: ampliación de la frontera agrícola; colonización asociada a pastos para la ganadería, minería, incendios forestales, cultivos de uso ilícito; infraestructura (centros urbanos y construcción de vías) y extracción de madera. 2) Biodiversidad, corresponsabilidad y compromisos globales: El país cumplirá con

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 answer to question 15 of the document to provide a clear and robust approach for integrating gender.

Evidence B: Two general strategies are provided but the project activities do not clearly reflect women participation.

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: Proposed activities and results demonstrate innovation and potential for scale transformative results generally in Section 2.

Evidence B: The use of geo-technologies in combination of indigenous knowledge is innovative. The work of the communities has been recognized globally


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 34/40

Average Total Score: 33/40

Performance of Eol 205 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: EOI is completely run by an organization of Indigenous Peoples.

Evidence B: funds would be received through Fundacion Suma Kawsay

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: The main proponent relevant and demonstrates exceptional leadership in the field for the proposed work, according to the document submitted by the interested parties.

Evidence B: Communities and organizations have received two global awards for their work

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: According to the document presented, shows that the main proponent has strong partnerships, particularly with other indigenous peoples' organizations, to carry out the work.

Evidence B: Communities and organizations have received two global awards for their work

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The organization appears to have adequate skills and capacity for the project, but have no experience with GEF projects according to the document presented.

Evidence B: Communities and organizations have received two global awards for their work

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: The document submitted by the interested demonstrates that meet all the criteria demonstrated past performance

Evidence B: IPCL does not have legal existence and would have to receive funds through Fundacion Suma Kawsay.

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: NA/2

Average: 0/2

Evidence A: The leading organization does not have experience with safeguards and other standards required by the GEF.

Evidence B: No

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 205 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

