

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 334

Organization: Consejo Indigena del Pueblo Tacana Cipt

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
334	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	25	28	19	72
334	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	25	34	16	75

Performance of Eol 334 in Andes/Amazon - 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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Proposed to be held in the region of the Bolivian Amazon in an area of global importance of culturally rich biodiversity.

Evidence B: the area is important for connectivity of a general area of high biodiversity with 60 % of Bolivia's flora, 93 endemic species and 51 endangered. It also seems to have potential as a model

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: According to the map.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Indígena territory is a qualified and recognized by the Bolivian state, however, there are always limitations to allow wide governance of indigenous peoples.

Evidence B: It is a legally recognized indigenous territory with a sophisticated indigenous governance structure.

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: The explanation is very clear and the connection to its cultural significance HATH very clearly described.

Evidence B: concentrated on explaining the environmental 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: The explanation of threats They're very clear and very detailed. I approach seems appropriate that give recognition of the threats is to counsel and territorial level. Threats are important and are in an area of high vulnerability wealth of resources that are in these territories.

Evidence B: The communities seem to be very active but have identified both social and environmental interconnected threats that if not addressed would put them back in their efforts.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: There is a strong law that protects concrete results through the proposal.

Evidence B: Bolivia seems to have a robust policy framework several elements of which were identified 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: If and is explained in the proposal.

Evidence B: Several legal instruments were identified in the project document

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: successful initiatives are described in a series of processes has several year ± os. This proposal arises to strengthen these processes.

Evidence B: The organisation has implemented 45 relevant projects with half of them active.

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: Mentioned initiatives that may be associated utilidad coplementar approaches to doing in this proposal, however, mention the limitation of not currently have co-funding to support this initiative. I feel very good the frankness with which answer this question it is useful to demonstrate the clarity with which it has developed this concept proposal.

Evidence B: The communities have a comprehensive and well defined strategy with several initiatives but not many additional ones were listed


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 334 in Andes/Amazon - 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: I think it seems that the proposal is fine raised and which is focused on strengthening the governance of TCOs.

Evidence B: The project addresses all four elements

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: The proposed building is fully aligned with the instruments of the organization. I think it is very clear and has excellent conceptualization. I only suggest delimit the scope of the results to be achieved during the year reaching changes as of execution. There are some that will be commensurate revised to be more focused and concrete results. Also on the integrated approach in the design as HATH of or faltar but concrete actions of the CIMTA to strengthen them.

Evidence B: The project seems well thought and aligns with the overall organization long term strategy. How the components such as the capacity building and communication fit together with the rest could be teased out 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: They seem like they're raised right. Some adjustments to achieve the runtime project.

Evidence B: The project would seem to be able to boost existing effort and contribute to the long-term strategy and aspirations of the communities

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: I would believe that if but must adjust some lines that are very broad in design ± or results framework and activities.

Evidence B: NA

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: Silver now there is no cofinancing but mention the social capital of organizations counterpart. I think I should emphasize that I think better than to invent they have if not to say that currently do not have.

Evidence B: The proponents not that their is little counterpart except for the communities own contributions

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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: If it is justified by the territory of the TCOs and their activities.

Evidence B: NA

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: I look very well developed. I think I have not checked up here one equal justification in additional aspects to cultural and livelihood level.

Evidence B: The livelihood projects are central

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: They have clarity of how sustainability works and propose alternatives to build it.

Evidence B: The project would contribute to a long term strategy and will ensure long-term benefits and strengthen IPLC governance but given it is part of a long-term strategy additional funding will continue to build on

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: I think it is clear that identify the relationship for the development of the proposal.

Evidence B: The project is well aligned. The overall community strategy is well aligned.

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: GÃ issues are well addressed © nero in component 4 but the justification in question 15 the need to strengthen the CIMTA mentioned. I suggest that for strengthening the CIMTA be achieved, it is integrated within the framework of results and activities thus effectively They will be able to be integrated, implemented and monitored. The link will solicit adjustment in the proposal.

*Evidence B:*The organization already has a solid foundation through a women's council.

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: I think this type of governance are conditions that must be promoted to achieve far-reaching results through © s and leadership of indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:*The project and the overall community long-term strategy it would support has demonstration capacity both in Bolivia and the region.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 34/40

Average Total Score: 31/40

Performance of Eol 334 in Andes/Amazon - 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: It is a proposal of indigenous peoples with the support of NGOs (WCS / CI)

Evidence B: The organization is a indigenous governance structure

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: NA/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: as TCO has an important leadership and evidence on successful initiatives and achievements that have their own operational, regulatory level and forms of organization.

Evidence B: The organisation is an indigenous organisation with several individual communities part of it.

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: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: HATH very clear relationship in its design ± or direct beneficiaries and posed

Evidence B: the proposing organization is an IPLC governance entity

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Experience with GEF projects has always been developed in partnership with other agencies. It is very important to get support for an adequate implementation.

Evidence B: NA

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: CIPTA mentioned that as an institution has handled 100,000 per annum with which could make the project support.

Evidence B: Does not seem to have managed large 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: 0/2 Reviewer B: NA/2

Average: 0/2

Evidence A: They mentioned who have no experience, but could be supported.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 17.5/30

Performance of Eol 334 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

