

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 359

Organization: Fundacion Mapuche Aniceto Norin

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
359	Southern Cone	Chile	12	14	10	36
359	Southern Cone	Chile	22	23	19	64

Performance of Eol 359 in Southern Cone - 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* This is an extremely intervened territory since the nineteenth century

*Evidence B:* High level importance for species (RSR), but no KBAs or intact forests. (Not so clear if the project proposal includes the whole area presented in the text, because several activities are more focused on smaller mapuche management units.)

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:* The territory of the project includes large urban areas, rural areas and highly intervened

*Evidence B:* NA

### 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: 4/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Although the Mapuche communities maintain some aspects of their culture, relations between the Chilean state and the Mapuche people are of absolute subordination. This includes the exercise of the right itself within the limits of existing national legislation, very few and defined community spaces, and non-recognition of the Mapuche political system.

*Evidence B:* Apparently the Mapuches do not manage the total area presented. But it is not so clear if the project proposal includes the whole area presented in the text, because several activities are more focused on smaller mapuche management units.

#### 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:* The description provided is based on historical aspects rather than the contemporary reality of the Mapuche communities.

*Evidence B:* Well stated. (What is not so clear, is the relation of the Mapuche land management with the conservation interests.)

#### 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:* This is a highly intervened area over the past 200 years, including the loss of native forest ecosystems. It is currently the largest surface area in the country of exotic forest plantations developed by large companies.

*Evidence B:* By the Eol and Cumulative Development Pressures and forest change.

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: 2/3

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The policy of the Chilean government has had a countervailing economic nature in the last decade, due to the poverty of the Mapuche communities, and involvement by extractive companies.

*Evidence B:* The project proposal asks support also to improve recognition.

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: 2/3

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The Chilean government is implementing programs seed funding for indigenous communities to formulate a productive proposal for a commercial purpose, a type of micro-enterprise. However, this support does not lead to the recognition of conservation initiatives, but rather to exploit natural resources.

*Evidence B:* The project proposal asks support also to improve recognition.

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:* The initiatives described relate to land reclamation under current legislation and government programs.

*Evidence B:* There are some initiatives mentioned, but seem mostly personal, informal, not strongly institutionalised.

#### 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: 0/2 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 0.5/2**

*Evidence A:* The initiatives described correspond to government programs or special situations.

*Evidence B:* There are probably more, but the proposal is not good enough (and we do not know more).


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 12/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 17/30

Performance of Eol 359 in Southern Cone - 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:* Most conservation actions described basically depend on its acceptance by the Chilean government authorities. Beyond the possibility of decision and control by IPLC.

*Evidence B:* It might be better, but the Eol is not clear enough (and we do not know more).

2. Does the Eol 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: 0/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* Just one example: most of the proposed activities are linked to travel to USA and Europe, visits by foreign investors, purchase of land by the government, access to research funds through universities, etc. There seems to be a realistic view of the situation of IPLC in the territory.

*Evidence B:* It might be better, but the Eol is not clear enough (and we do not know more).

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: 2/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* There seems to be a realistic view of the situation of IPLC in the territory.

*Evidence B:* The relations between the proposed activities and nature conservation is not clear enough – although it could be good for strengthening the community organisation.

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: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* It is possible, but not finance activities seem clearly identified.

*Evidence B:* NA

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

*Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The proposal is supported by funds obtained through compensation of the State of Chile for human rights violations, and small governmental programs for the agricultural sector.



*Evidence B:* It might be better, but the EoI is not clear enough (and we do not know more).

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

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Figures provided in EoI

*Evidence B:* And the intervention area is not completely clear.

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:* 1/3 *Reviewer B:* 2/3

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The proposed indicators mostly seem to align with a commercial venture

*Evidence B:* EoI not clear enough.

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:* The vision provided basically rests on the proponent

*Evidence B:* Not clear the long term impacts. It might be better, but the EoI is not clear enough (and we do not know more).

### 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:* There seems to be clearly established relationship

*Evidence B:* It is high probable that it is better, but the EoI is not clear enough (and we do not know more).

### 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: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Proposes incorporating women in positions of leadership in initiatives to attract private capital for investment in the territory, but not explained what cultural gender perspective in these business relationships.

*Evidence B:* NA

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 project seems to be closer to a proposed business investment for the exploitation of natural resources of the territory, an initiative of biodiversity conservation

*Evidence B:*NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/40

Average Total Score: 18.5/40

Performance of Eol 359 in Southern Cone - 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* While the proposal is presented by a foundation, this indigenous Mapuche people conform, receiving assistance from business partners

*Evidence B:*NA

### 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: 6/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* The proponent based its proposal on the figure of a specific leader, a traditional Mapuche authority.

*Evidence B:*According to the EoI.

### 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5*

**Average: 1.5/5**

*Evidence A:* There is no specific identification of partners, or the role of these in the project.

*Evidence B:* NA

#### 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:* The proposal seems a venture of commercial properties, and not a conservation initiative.

*Evidence B:* Not clear enough in the EoI to score better.

#### 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:* It demonstrated some ability in managing a company that produces dry wood, and a compensation fund for human rights violations.

*Evidence B:* Not clear enough in the Eol to score better.

## 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 evidence is presented to the subject.

*Evidence B:* NA

### Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 10/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30*

**Average Total Score: 14.5/30**

Performance of Eol 359 in Southern Cone - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

