

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 373

Organization: Asociación Civil Red Agroforestal Chaco Argentina – REDAF -

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
373	Gran Chaco	Argentina	21	29	20	70
373	Gran Chaco	Argentina	22	32	20	74

Performance of Eol 373 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: 3/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* This is an area of the basin of the Pilcomayo, territory of the Chaco in northern Argentina, an ecosystem shared with two other countries

*Evidence B:* The territory is located close to the Gran Chaco region, a key biodiversity area, in the Salta Province, Argentina. Territory fully and collectively owned by 130 indigenous communities belonging to 4 different native nations.

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: 1/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* Most of the area is held and preserved by indigenous communities. Parts of the area used by non-indigenous families for cattle raising purposes.

### 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:* The territory is in the process of titling after a ruling by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in favor of indigenous communities.

*Evidence B:* A recent international court (Inter-American Court of Human Rights) decision upholds the indigenous communities' collective land ownership. The lands in questions were state-owned lands. Salta (Argentina) must now issue a collective land title. Currently, most of the land is being held and managed by the communities. However, part of the land is being used for cattle raising by non-indigenous families, who have recently agreed to move out of the proposed project area. Community-based governance systems will now have to be further developed to manage the entire project area.

#### 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:* Information is adequate

*Evidence B:* Answer to question 2 mainly focused on governance. Very little information was provided about the spiritual and cultural significance of the area. Further information could be requested to better comprehend particular attachment of the communities as they belong to different native nations.

#### 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: 2/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* There are threats and pressures evident in the territory

*Evidence B:* Main threats include logging and cattle raising. Infrastructure work focusing on the Pilcomayo river contributes to water pollution in certain areas.

D) Opportunities for ICI results - including enabling policy conditions, positive government support and presence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up.

6. Are enabling policy conditions in place for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area?

*Scoring:*

- Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize limited rights for IPLCs over their lands and/or resources;
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The area is in a process of implementing a favorable ruling to indigenous communities by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

*Evidence B:* From a legal point of view, there is a clear and solid legal foundation for indigenous-led conservation of the entire project area. A single land title acknowledging full collective land ownership for 130 communities is a major enabling fact. Territorial integrity is being secured.

7. Is there active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed country/area?

*Scoring:*

- National or sub-national governments are actively opposed to IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have recognized the importance of IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments are actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* In the opinion, there are some government programs underway in the territory

*Evidence B:* Various national and sub-national conservation programs support conservation by indigenous peoples. Since end-2019, the Salta Province has been consulting with the indigenous communities about conservation-focused projects. Indigenous communities engaging and participating in relevant conservation efforts led by the federal and provincial government.

## 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:* 3/3

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Apparently the greatest effort Wichí organization has been focused on recovery efforts and protection of their lands.

*Evidence B:* A few conservation projects were mentioned. However, these projects were key to survey the land belonging to all 130 communities and identify areas used for cattle raising by non-indigenous families. In turn, the results of this work were used as evidence in court and led to a major victory in a major indigenous land rights case against Argentina. The favorable court decision and the agreement reached with the non-indigenous families to move out of the project area, are quite successful initiatives with major environmental and social implications.

## 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:* Similar projects underway, even more emphasis on aspects of conservation of natural resources

*Evidence B:* A few initiatives were mentioned, which are mainly managed by project proponent and project partners, not by the indigenous organization Lhaka Honhat. However, the international court in question ordered Argentina to create a \$2,000,000 fund to be fully managed by Lhaka Honhat to benefit the 130 indigenous communities.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 21.5/30

Performance of Eol 373 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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* In principle there is a remarkable alignment

*Evidence B:*Enabling conditions are optimal. Project activities and goals are 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* It is necessary to specifically demonstrate what specific actions contemplated in the conservation of biodiversity in the territory are

*Evidence B:*Project activities and goals are clear. But no information is provided about how forest restoration would be pursued in areas used for cattle raising. Further information should be requested.

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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Advocacy actions are fundamental to this proposal and are well raised

*Evidence B:* The enabling conditions are optimal. Territorial integrity has been secured. Solid foundations for conservation by the indigenous communities concerned.

#### 4. Are the activities achievable within a \$500,000 to \$2,000,000 USD budget range in a period of 5 years of project execution?

*Scoring:*

- Activities/results not aligned with Eol range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* It is necessary to relate funds available time-action-plan. While some of the proposed actions can demand a great economic contribution, much of the action plan could be done in a shorter period that covered the horizon.

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities can certainly be achieved with the budget range in question and within the project period.

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Parallel initiatives are in tune with this project



*Evidence B:*A few sources of co-financing were included. However, a \$2,000,000 fund to be fully managed by Lhaka Honhat provides additional support.

**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:* The territorial area involved is well identified and defined: 400.000 has

*Evidence B:*Large project area. Realistic because of the legal security gained over the entire project area.

**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 description presented is suitable

*Evidence B:*Some additional cultural and livelihoods results were mentioned. Project Proponent states that further consultations with indigenous communities on these results will be carried out in a later stage to better address them.

**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: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* It is not possible to verify the proposed solid vision about the future sustainability of the project

*Evidence B:* Answer to question 16 was not very clear. But taking into account the legal foundations of this project, long-term sustainability is feasible.

### 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The purpose of the project conforms to the national action plan on biodiversity

*Evidence B:* EoI does fall within national policy priorities. It clearly identifies such priorities and project activities are consistent with them.

### 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 gender approach is appropriate

*Evidence B:* EoI builds upon previous work carried out with considerable participation of women. However, no specific project activity or goal focuses on gender mainstreaming.

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

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* There are still outstanding issues of great relevance, as the results of the current titling process in the territory.

*Evidence B:* While substantial work was done to secure legal security over the entire project area, a few projects had a conservation focus. But the potential for conservation-focused activities in the project area is not only considerable but also sought by the communities.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 30.5/40

Performance of Eol 373 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: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* a suitable functional relationship between REDAF and Lhaka shown Honhat

*Evidence B:* The Project proponent is not an indigenous organization. Project partners include indigenous (Lhaka Honhat) and non-indigenous organizations. It would be advisable to make Lhaka Honhat play a co-management role in the project for capacity building purposes.

### B) Demonstrated on the ground leadership related to Indigenous Peoples and/or Local Community Conservation.

2. Does the lead proponent demonstrate on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work?

Scoring:

- None demonstrated;
- Limited demonstration of relevant on-ground leadership;
- Demonstrated on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work;
- Exceptional and long-standing on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work

*Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* Lhaka Honhat achieved a favorable ruling on their rights to the lands of the territory to the Argentine State

*Evidence B:* That leadership exists. But project relies on the involvement of the communities concerned. Making the Lhaka Honhat play a more leading role would ensure indigenous leadership in the project.

### 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The evidence is sufficient

*Evidence B:* Project proponent and the non-indigenous project partner have strong partnerships with the indigenous communities. It is clear that they have worked together in the past. They trust each other.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* a convenient articulation between the technical capabilities of different organizations executing the project is described.

*Evidence B:* EoI with elements that reflect such capacity. Technical support to be provided by project proponent and non-indigenous project partner are critical.

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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* Most of the projects previously handled correspond to relatively small amounts

*Evidence B:* Project proponent and non-indigenous project partner have necessary capacity. No clear information was provided about the capacity of the indigenous project partner.

## 6. Does lead organization have experience with safeguards and other standards required by GEF?

*Scoring:*

- Answered no;
- Answered yes but with weak or lacking explanation to the extent;
- Answered yes with clear explanation of the extent

*Reviewer A: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* The organization already implemented GEF projects previously

*Evidence B:* Project proponent with previous experience working in a GEF-funded project. It reflects familiarity with GEF safeguards and standards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 373 in Gran Chaco - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

