

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 178

Organization: ASOCIACIÓN CIVIL ORGANIZACIÓN ZONAL DE CRIOLLOS DE LOS BLANCOS

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Alejandro Herrera	178	Gran Chaco	Argentina	18	18	7	43
Christopher Jordan	178	Gran Chaco	Argentina	16	22	16	54

Performance of Eol 178 in Gran Chaco - 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: 2/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* The area of the project presents a remarkable biodiversity

*Evidence B:* There is some overlap with KBAs but lower species range-size rarity. The area is important for biodiversity, but less so than the more biodiverse areas with high endemism levels.

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: NA/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* There is significant potential to contribute to mitigate climate change

*Evidence B:* I think on average the values are >50 t/ha. The applicants might be concerned about these figures not including carbon stored in soils.

### 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* According to the evidence presented, the territory appears to be under a clear state governance with indigenous territorial spaces

*Evidence B:* The territories and communal lands do not seem officially recognized. The nature of the IPLC governance was unclear in the proposal but it seems like communities do have their decision-making process over the lands.

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

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* This is a proposal by a local community of non-indigenous peasants. It does not delve into the indigenous cultural heritage on the territory. EOI does not seem to have been prepared with intellectual participation of representatives of indigenous peoples

*Evidence B:* The history of the project area is clearly described, including its cultural and economic significance.

#### 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: 3/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* It is an area with a growing intervention of land for livestock, and other activities in the field of mining

*Evidence B:* The proposal mentions the oncoming agricultural frontier and the adjacent land acquisition deals, Global Forest Change layer, and development pressures seem medium-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: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* It is a proposal somewhat complex because of the involvement of organizations of three (3) countries. The analysis provides information not sufficient in this regard.

*Evidence B:* Argentina does not appear to have titled the lands in this project, and the legal framework outlined in the proposal is not extremely convincing. Bolivia remains complicated for indigenous peoples and Paraguay does not adequately recognize their rights. The response in the proposal exclusively referenced Argentina.

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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* All the evidence presented in supporting ongoing projects makes clear the strong support of government programs

*Evidence B:* The proposal references a local initiative with government support in Argentina called “El Futuro está en el Monte”.

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:* Ongoing projects generally depend on government support

*Evidence B:* In Argentina, “El Futuro está en el Monte” appears to have active projects and government support. Little information on Bolivia and Paraguay was provided.

#### 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:* It is basically government initiatives

*Evidence B:* “El Futuro está en el Monte” has some support that appear complementary. Not all of the projects cited are related to project goals. Most support referenced offer in kind support.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 17/30

Performance of Eol 178 in Gran Chaco - 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:* In general, there is a demonstration in keeping with the guiding principles ICI

*Evidence B:* While the creation and implementation of the management and conservation plans seem like a useful process to provide opportunities for the region, the potential global environmental benefits seem lower than in other proposals simply because the boundaries for economic opportunities and management are not well delineated.

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* It is necessary to improve passing from the statement of principles of sustainable management of the territory, to identify nodes for indigenous-peoples indigenous-management of the project farmers trinational joint.

*Evidence B:* The application of the plans for conservation, management, and sustainable livelihoods is not clearly outlined. The creation of platforms is mentioned, but they include some significant conflicts (land rights, conflicts with companies, etc) and there is no clear discussion of how these conflicts will be resolved. The implementation of the resulting plans remains vague because they need to be created first.

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: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* How regulations are articulated and local governments trinalational in the same territorial space conservation?

*Evidence B:* The result will be a strategic plan that highlights the path forward with some investment in opportunities and threat mitigation, though others will need to come from future investment. The plan and the space for discussion do appear useful. Some other general activities are mentioned, but are not specific enough to conclude that they will address threats or create 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Some of the processes to unleash can take periods of time exceden the terms of the proposal

*Evidence B:* The activities are achievable within this range of investment.

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:* The sources identified are contributions of local government programs. It is unclear whether the situation is similar in the three countries. No specific sources described with specific inputs.

*Evidence B:* The majority of co-financing appears to be in kind support and no numbers are provided, though there does seem to be significant support for the initiative “El Futuro está en el Monte”, of which this NGO is a part.

## 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* It is required to review and refine these indicators. The information provided is unclear. Consider the three countries.

*Evidence B:* Question 12 lists the entire project area as 7.2 million hectares, but the areas with direct intervention will be 200,000 hectares.

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: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Review these indicators, distinguishing what are rather actions, linking them with the proposed work program. Review set forth in Question 16 to build cultural indicators.

*Evidence B:* Some of the indicators are not mentioned in other parts of the proposal (i.e. the Apps) whereas others seem aligned.

## 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:* No strong view on the subject. It is merely a statement of possibilities with no basis in previous experience developed.

*Evidence B:* The organization is depending on a broader alliance adopting the plan that is created and raising money to invest in the actions outlined in the plan. Ideally there can be a more organized approach to long-term sustainability, but at the very least the alliances do appear to be numerous.

## 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: 2/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* trilateral analysis unappreciated.

*Evidence B:* The project references Argentina's national priorities, but not Bolivia and Paraguay.

## 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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* It is not described accurately and clearly what the role of women in the project, although there is an interesting analysis of the contemporary situation of indigenous women v / s non-indigenous.

*Evidence B:* The proposal highlights gender mainstreaming throughout.

#### 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* The proposal basically rests on government pilot programs in a specific area within the Gran Chaco, it lacks a trinational perspective.

*Evidence B:* If the plan is truly supported by the IPLCs across the region, the potential is large, but there is some risk of getting adequate buy in from all IPLC organizations.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/40

Average Total Score: 20/40

Performance of Eol 178 in Gran Chaco - 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: 6/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* It is an interesting amalgam between non-indigenous peasants and indigenous communities, with strong support localized Argentine government initiatives.

*Evidence B:* The proposal is led by a Campesino 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* The organization does not demonstrate greater influence beyond the Salta Chaco, or it is indirect.

*Evidence B:* The Organization is a part of several alliances, but it seems like their leadership remains fairly local. Their direct involvement with indigenous peoples and capacity to run consultation processes is not explicitly mentioned.

### 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The fact that organizations in Paraguay and Bolivia are basically farmers requires further description of these partnerships, particularly with regard to the form of participation of indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:* The roles are not extremely clear, but there is some level of detail differentiating the different partners. Ideally the indigenous organizations would have been more elevated within the proposal to understand what they might lead.

#### 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* Do not allow the capabilities described relate to the purposes of the project.

*Evidence B:* The organization refers to a network of experts that they can draw on if needed to fill gaps. Their experience in some area of the project (FPIC and others) are not explicit in the proposal, but they do include indigenous and other partners that could help with this role.

#### 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: 2/6*

**Average: 1/6**

*Evidence A:* His previous experience is clearly reduced with respect to the scale needed for this Eol

*Evidence B:* The organization provides annual audits, their funds seems to primarily come from the government, and it does not appear that the organization itself has managed a project over \$200,000.

## 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:* No previous experience as set forth in the Eol.

*Evidence B:* NA

## Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 7/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30*

**Average Total Score: 11.5/30**

Performance of Eol 178 in Gran Chaco - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

