

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 376

Organization: Gobierno Autónomo Indígena Campesino Charagua Iyambae

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Alejandro Herrera	376	Gran Chaco	Bolivia	28	40	28	96
Jadder Mendoza Lewis	376	Gran Chaco	Bolivia	23	25	20	68

Performance of Eol 376 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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The area of the Chaco is an area of great importance for biodiversity in the region

Evidence B: Strategic area of water conservation and associated biodiversity. Relevant in a South American reservation. Important cultural habitat

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: The High deterioration of the natural forest, intends to work in fragmented forests without low carbon reserve.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: This proposal is presented by the autonomous government Guarani Charagua Iyambae, being the first municipality (Charagua) to implement indigenous autonomy in Bolivia in 2015.

Evidence B: There are recent legal basis for tenure rights and governments are in the process of joint IPLC

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: In addition to the importance of Charagua for Guarani, this area includes two conservation areas and a protected national park

Evidence B: Promotes relations native cosmovision with natural systems as the basis of sustainability

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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: As the whole area of the Gran Chaco, Bolivia this area experienced significant pressures that will lead to imminent loss of biodiversity not to intervene with initiatives such as this project

Evidence B: The high incidence of poverty, threatens to accelerated deterioration of ecosystems for subsistence, pressured by traffic of land for agriculture, livestock. Threat to water sources

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: The status of autonomous indigenous government and the existing legal framework in Bolivia, contribute significantly to the promotion of indigenous governance widely

Evidence B: Recognition of autonomy and governance in managing the conservation and sustainable use

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The main executor is an indigenous local government, with precise links at government level

Evidence B: It is not clear cooperation mechanism national or subnational government. joint actions is evident, but not a solid support framework

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Guarani organized communities have a long history of conservation in the territory

Evidence B: There is clearly no explicit effort, participation from own government stands. Especially in the creation of an AP

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Evidence provided is more than enough. There are technical assistance projects for water conservation and management of natural land and resources.

Evidence B: Lack of clarity of the relationship of the aforementioned project on the synergy with the project, a connection is inferred in ecosystem management actions from communities


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 25.5/30

Performance of Eol 376 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: careful organization of objectives and actions described results.

Evidence B: It is not clear how autonomy and territorial management is consolidated from the project, however the goals credited to improve driving conditions biodiversity

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The inclusion of actions to adapt to climate change and disaster prevention, is notable in this proposal. This is an area of action rarely frequent in this type of project.

Evidence B: Clearly the objectives and actions, there are limitations of the gender approach and extensive relationship with the IPLC own systems of land management and customary use of natural resources and traditional knowledge.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: an orderly organization of actions and goals to achieve is found.

Evidence B: There ambitions and expectations of high value for the life of the project, however the crisis and threat of natural resources is limitedly clear as faced with the project, especially the dynamics of change of use of soil

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: It balance between financing, actions and time the project is observed.

Evidence B: Extensive descriptions of actions by objective, strategy and relationship integration with traditional systems IPLC is slightly visible

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The information presented exceeds USD 1 million per project.

Evidence B: A unique project is currently in the area, integration of local government institutions is presumed, but the binding framework is not explicit

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The area considered over 4 million hectares

Evidence B: Impact on 3 AP covering more than 1 M has estimated.

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: Including the emergence of new leaderships Guarani and particularly by women, it is a very significant contribution as a result of the project.

Evidence B: Indicators are explicit in sustainable development, specifically related to the cultural aspects of the IPLC are unclear.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The position of indigenous autonomous municipal government provides a unique strength to the sustainability of the project.

Evidence B: Clearly the integration of self-government in the medium term is limited to demonstrate the social changes of IPLC in sustainability management

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The project presents a detailed description of the contributions to the ODS.

Evidence B: The project identifies challenges in national policies, but limited in terms of specific goals.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The project describes an approach suitable gender, especially regarding the role of women in land tenure and sustainable productive activities they develop.

Evidence B: There is no intension integration of focus, lack of clarity of the strategy or mechanism is unknown gender gaps

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: This project can contribute significantly to the cause of indigenous governance in other areas, in conservation of biodiversity.

Evidence B: There is local integration in the management of biodiversity and the environment, with local participation and empowerment


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 40/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/40

Average Total Score: 32.5/40

Performance of Eol 376 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: There is sufficient evidence in the EoI about the characteristics of the relationship between the Government Autonomous Indigenous and Peasant Charagua Iyambae Natura Bolivia Foundation, a relationship that appears well founded.

Evidence B: Is a combined proposal, the roles of the IPLC is not very explicit.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The condition of Indigenous Campesino Self-Government Charagua Iyambae is the result of a long process of leadership in Bolivia. Remember that this is the first indigenous autonomous government established in Bolivia under the current rules, in a process initiated in 2009 by the Guarani, and culminated in 2015.

Evidence B: Gestate organizations longstanding processes, how they integrate the IPLC is unclear, especially in governance

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: 3/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: It presents clear evidence of multiple links with both local community organizations such as government departments and international organizations.

Evidence B: There is integration of IPLC, the roles are not clear, other organizations identify key

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The proposing organization has executed or has been linked to at the least 3 GEF projects.

Evidence B: Demonstrate ability, organization, it is not clear on the goals of the proposed project.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The evidence is sufficient.

Evidence B: They have superior ability delicacy resources 1M

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: GEF projects have been implemented and other international.

Evidence B: mentioned antecedent linked to trust policies, with no clarification referred to standards GEF

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 376 in Gran Chaco - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

