

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 337

Organization: Federación por la Autodeterminación de los Pueblos Indígenas (FAPI)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Alejandro Herrera	337	Gran Chaco	Paraguay	20	28	24	72
Leonardo, Crippa	337	Gran Chaco	Paraguay	21	31	26	78

Performance of Eol 337 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: The area of the project is an important part of the Paraguayan Amazon

Evidence B: The indigenous territory in question overlaps San Rafael National Park. This park is a key biodiversity area.

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Corresponds to the area of the Atlantic Forest of Alto Paraná, biodiversity hotspot

Evidence B: The integrity of the area has been damaged. Agribusiness, cattle raising, and logging seem to be the main drivers of deforestation.

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The information provided is not sufficient to clearly determine the existence of institutions and recognition of rights for the governance of the territory

Evidence B: It is not clear whether the Mbya Guarani People owns the entire project area. However, it is clear that there are self-determined governing structures in place.

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: A detailed explanation is presented of the cultural significance of the area proposed in the draft

Evidence B: The cultural and spiritual connection with the land has been clearly stated. Native language terms reflect such connection.

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: 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The evidence indicates the need for urgent action for conservation because of the increasing pressure on the territory and the fragility of it.

Evidence B: There are external threats, such as agribusiness, cattle raising, and logging. But they are the usual threats seeking to hold and exploit the resources pertaining to the area's indigenous lands.

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: Supports that can be derived from the regulatory framework are ambiguous with respect to the rights of Mbya communities.

Evidence B: Paraguay's conservation-related policies and programs reflect support to the Mbya Guarani People's governing bodies. The 2008 State-issued resolution acknowledging the cultural and conservation value of the indigenous territory in questions is another clear enabling policy condition.

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: Evidence is presented in this regard, but its focus is more on actions focused on the environment rather than the role of indigenous communities

Evidence B: The conservation-related programs mentioned above are held at the national and local level. They are inclusive of indigenous participation. The Mbya Guarani People has been actively playing a role in such programs.

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: The information provided is not sufficient

Evidence B: The 2008 State-issued resolution mentioned above is the outcome of the Mbya Guarani People's land claim. In my opinion, this land claim is a successful conservation initiative that guarantees sustainability.

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: An important part of the data presented in this regard by the proposing organization, refers to a bill presented to a source of international funding but not approved yet.

Evidence B: Two relevant projects. They refer to the protection of the indigenous territory and capacity building for forest management. They are aligned with the project goals but investments are moderate.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 20.5/30

Performance of Eol 337 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: The objectives and the action plan proposed interrelated. However, since one of the main problems is the lack of control that Mbyá communities have over their lands and territories, which are recognized even under management of NGOs, what specific actions are specifically formulated in this line? It is, is based on what actions proposed Mbyá can regain territorial control over the Tekoha Guazú without being possibly displaced by other actors with consolidated political influence?

Evidence B: The project proponent and partners are all indigenous organizations. They are based on (and respond to) clear indigenous grass-roots organizations.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: a more comprehensive definition about Life Plans Community is necessary. While currently constitute a very important tool, often they require systematizations and updates not always present, which can lead to seek external technical support. Have you considered the support of academic institutions linked to research + development + own recognition of rights?

Evidence B: Activities and results are linked to the aspirations of the Mbya Guarani People. The governing bodies and grass-roots organizations align with such aspirations, which can guarantee sustainability over time.

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: The objectives and activities seem realistic

Evidence B: Strengthening the governance structures in place helps address the threats. Enabling conditions appear to be optimal.

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: Some activities could be developed in shorter terms

Evidence B: The activities are achievable. The fact that all the institutions involved in this project are indigenous and are inter-connected guarantees full engagement of the indigenous communities concerned in decision-making and project implementation.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Cofinancing described is relatively low for the period specified in the project

Evidence B: As stated earlier, there are two projects in place that complement this particular project. While the funds of those projects are not substantial, their goals align with this project's goals.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 1/5

Evidence A: The territory involved in the project is limited in area and population, although environmentally important

Evidence B: The project area is small. Because of such size or dimensions, the project seems manageable by the proponent and its partners.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: But require better definition, cultural indicators provided are aligned with the project

Evidence B: Indicators are not clearly stated. Could be improved to better reflect relevance to the project.

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: You will need to improve relations with local governments and other agencies of state government

Evidence B: The Mbya Guarani People is clearly attached to the land in question. Project benefits will strengthen governing bodies and grass-root organizations, which in turn ensures long-term sustainability.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: National priorities seem to be more strictly biological environmental issues without necessarily include the participation of communities Mbyá specifically.

Evidence B: Consistency with national policy priorities. Proposed activities and actions in progress aligned with such priorities as well.

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: It is important that the organization proposing describe in detail what the verification mechanism of participation of women pointing to the project.

Evidence B: Clear awareness from an indigenous perspective. No specific result targets gender mainstreaming per se.

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Although the organization proposing it does not, the experience can have a significant impact on other areas and communities of indigenous peoples of the Paraguay that are part of FAPI

Evidence B: Proposed project reflects clear indigenous leadership. All institutions involved in this project are indigenous.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 31/40

Average Total Score: 29.5/40

Performance of Eol 337 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: greater direct involvement of NGOs is observed for the implementation of the proposal, but rather community organizations Mbyá

Evidence B: Project proponent and partners are indigenous organizations. No NGO is involved.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: There is sufficient evidence presented in history and links

Evidence B: FAPI seems to lead actions at national level. FAPI clearly connected to and supportive of grass-root indigenous organizations—e.g. land claim resulting in state recognition of cultural and conservation value of land in question.

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: The organization represents a kind of confederation of Mbyá communities.

Evidence B: Existing partnership is strong among project proponent and partners. Clear attachment to the land in question, and strong relationship with grass-root indigenous organizations.

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 has no previous experience with GEF, but with international financing projects.

Evidence B: Capacity in place for proposed project activities. Project activities and results fall within the expertise of proponent and partners.

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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: There is evidence enough.

Evidence B: There is relevant project management experience stated in the EoL. Past projects indicate investments were moderate and manageable.

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 organization says it has no experience.

Evidence B: Apparently, there is no previous experience.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 337 in Gran Chaco - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

