

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 173

Organization: Comunidad del Pueblo Orginario Vilela de Pampa Pozo – Lote 110

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
173	Gran Chaco	Argentina	13	19	10	42
173	Gran Chaco	Argentina	12	13	16	41

Performance of Eol 173 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: people originating community territory located in the Dry Chaco of Argentina, with important biological diversity and devastation.

Evidence B: the general area of the Chaco is important

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

- >50 t/ha - Low;
- 50 - 100 t/ha - Moderate;
- >100 t/ha - High

Reviewer A: NA/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: low with region tonne of carbon and vegetation and soil.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: people originating communities working in land management but have not presented consistent formal references on the recognition of formal rights of these communities.

Evidence B: The territory seems to be under practical control of IPLC and Ley 26.160 de Relevamiento Territorial Indígena ha permitido el relevamiento territorial comunitario

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: According to the indigenous worldview this region is not only a set of trees or a source of merchandise and has the most meaning to life. Plants and animals have cultural importance, health and community.

Evidence B: The project describes the communal agricultural practices of the community that have contributed to sustaining biodiversity

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: Devastation soil since the decade of 80. The reduction of the area for grazing has impacted animals. The families have suffered economic impacts and has exploited the charcoal as a source of resources.

Evidence B: The chaco area is under significant threat. the described area is under threat from forest cover change and cumulative development pressures.

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: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Practices successful conservation with non maderaveis projects, for example the construction of a factory of Community cheese and goats The desenvociação communities. There are several legal demands for land and are not resolved because the legislation is not consistent.

Evidence B: The supportive framework of Argentina seems weak from the National IPLC support actions highlighted in CDB reports or mentioned in the project document

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Implementing social policies for desenvolvimento of small projects. Pendencies in the recognition of indigenous lands

Evidence B: The supportive framework of Argentina seems weak from the National IPLC support actions highlighted in CDB reports or mentioned in the project document except for some agric. support

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: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The initiatives are more focused on the minimum income offer than strictly for conservation.

Evidence B: the projects mentioned have limited relevance

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: NA/2 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: Few institutions of the current international cooperation in the country. Only possibility to use the infrastructure of communities.

Evidence B: few mentioned


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 13/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 12/30

Average Total Score: 12.5/30

Performance of Eol 173 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The proposal of this approach focused on the support of small projects and courses, what is relevant, but does not provide a claresa as environmental conservation and management of indigenous territories.

Evidence B: The project places a great emphasis on livelihoods and this will certainly contribute to decreasing pressure on biodiversity but seems to lack an accompanying more biodiversity conservation component.

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: The project does not clearly presented as will be strengthened indigenous governance and environmental conservation.

Evidence B: The project requires significant development. Three results are presented but it is not clear how they cohere or respond to the threats

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The proposal is limited to support sustainability initiatives (beekeeping and ecological agriculture) and conducting courses. The proposal does not clearly aparesenta will be strengthened as the indigenous governance and environmental conservation.

*Evidence B:*The project ideas is underdeveloped to really be able to tell

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Forecast perform sustentabiliade economic activities of communities and courses that are compatible with the budget.

*Evidence B:*the proposed activities may be below budget... hard to tell from the proposal

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The applicant offers its infraestructura, which includes training center and accommodation and vehicles and production infrastructure and marketing.

Evidence B: potential sources identified only

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: - 413 370 ha of "native forests" - 150,000 ha of which have not yet "relevadas, Total 563 370 ha

En base a los datos oficiales del Indigenous Territorial relevamiento done by el Instituto Nacional de Asuntos Indigenous between 2014-2018, la superficie de territory of native forest communities en las intervening en el proyecto es of 413,370 has close to 150,000 hectares of todavía communities in relevadas , giving a total of 563 370 ha

Evidence B: 563.370 ha to be impacted according to proposal

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: No presentaas answers on such issues.

Evidence B: women and youth to improve their capacities and income which presumably would reduce pressure on biodiversity

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: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The applicant states that the overall result of beekeeping and the empowerment of communities to serve the long-term sustainability of communities. Quantitative data were not presented.

Evidence B: As a productive project it offers a very general and somewhat vague plan only

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The proposal is in accordance with the 2016-2020 plan foresees support biodiversity conservation, restoration of degraded ecosystems and family agricultural and indigenous peoples.

Evidence B: 3 objectives of the NDC presented and the project could be said to contribute to these but the contribution is not articulated

D) Demonstrated gender mainstreaming in all activities.

10. Does the EoI provide a clear and robust approach to gender mainstreaming?

Scoring:

- Gender mainstreaming approach is absent;
- Gender mainstreaming approach is weak;

- Gender mainstreaming approach is moderately thought through (if there are a few activities as 'add ons');
- Significant and well-thought through approach to gender mainstreaming

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposal foresees the role of indigenous women protagonists of indigenous women in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the project.

Evidence B: The approach is pretty general

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: NA/5

Average: 1/5

Evidence A: As already mentioned, the proposal does not provide a contundende intervention for the governance of indigenous territories and conservation of the environment.

Evidence B: The project does not have strong ToC


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 13/40

Average Total Score: 16/40

Performance of Eol 173 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The proposal is led by an organization of the IPLC, but not clearly demonstrated the link with its technical team presented.

Evidence B: The proposing organization and associates are all IPLCs

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: The applicant and has more than one driven design po PICL from local offices in the territory, The propornete cordena network at least one network of local organizations PICL

dirigen from su base en un urban center. X La organización tiene uno o más proyectos led by PICL from these locales workshops el ground. X La organización coordina al menos una red de organizaciones locales PICL, base organizaciones Community u otros de la sociedad civil groups, acting en una o más del Regions country. X La organización coordina for it less una red de organizaciones locales PICL, base organizaciones Community u otros de la sociedad civil groups,

Evidence B: The organization seems to have some expereience

C) Proven relevant experience in working with IPLC networks, alliances and organizations/ strength of partnerships on the ground.

3. Does Eol 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: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Organizations of IPCL are listed only as project cordenadoras, there is more information about what it means in practical terms the coordenação project.

Evidence B: The proposing entity is an IPLC and the associates too and they seem to have experience working together

D) Technical expertise and capacity to address environmental problems, root causes and barriers.

4. Does Eol 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: The proponent has not clearly demonstrated its link with the technical team presented.

Evidence B: it is not clear that the capacity exists

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: Absence of audit. the years were not presented in the propente received the resources of the projects it submitted

Evidence B: The organization has no experience with this size of projects.

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: NA/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The applicant has no experience with the GEF.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 10/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 13/30

Performance of Eol 173 in Gran Chaco - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

