

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 176

Organization: Central de Pueblos Indígenas de La Paz (CPILAP) en representación de la Central Indígena del PuebloLeco de Apolo (CIPLA), del Pueblo Indígena de San José de Uchupiamonas (PI-SJU), del Consejo Regional T’simane Mosetene de Pílón Lajas (CRTM-PL) y de la Marka Cololo Copacabana Antaquilla (MCCA).

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
176	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	25	37	19	81
176	Andes/Amazon	Bolivia	27	36	25	88

Performance of Eol 176 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: The proposed area is in the Tropical Andes Biodiversity Hotspot. Conservation corridor in the Madidi-Tambopata Cotapata- and Tambopata Madidi Great Landscape.

Evidence B: The proposed project is located in the Andes-Amazon region (Madidi-Tambopata hotspot), not the Chaco. However, your pull down menu on the first page only allowed to choose Bolivia under "Chaco"

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: According to the map

Evidence B: According to the Carbon map, this region is of the utmost importance.

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: According to the law of Bolivia. Whenever difficulties arise regarding the full implementation of their rights however, the rules shows that it is this qualification.

Evidence B: On average, there is a 90% overlap of indigenous territories and conservation areas. Therefore, the territories are co-managed by IP and government agencies.

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: If so very thorough and appropriate. In addition, the links with environmental aspects.

Evidence B: Yes, the area is the home of several indigenous peoples from the lowlands to the highlands in the Andes.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The poses quite well and shows that this area is in very good condition and therefore threats are explained.

Evidence B: Yes, the area is highly threatened by the expansion of agriculture, mining and illegal logging, mainly.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: If there are conditions in this area and particularly, the articulation with the state (through its instance protected areas) shows potential and denotes that is favorable.

Evidence B: There is a favorable framework in Bolivia for local and indigenous management. The problem is that it is not fully implemented.

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: If according to the proposal

Evidence B: In general there is a favorable legal framework in the region.

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: According to the description there are several items to display examples presented as a successful and sustainable in recent years.

Evidence B: There are many ongoing projects that need to scale up, this proposed project can help to elicit that jump.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: organizational initiatives and further 5 projects in partnership with WCS are presented.

Evidence B: There are several projects that are aligned with this proposed project.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/30

Average Total Score: 26/30

Performance of Eol 176 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: I look very aligned with the objectives of the initiative and with a focus on strengthening indigenous governance based on their own systems.

Evidence B: CPILAP is an umbrella organization that includes smaller regional organizations that are well positioned to achieve proposed goals.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The proposal presents a general objective (which most do not have) and has a logic that links directly with 4 results. They give scope for the proposal to be made in 4 specific territories, which gives continuity with dice and processes articulate with indicators of life plans or land management plans that have been developed. There is perhaps a minimum observations on a couple of activities where they detail missing through that would be achieved perform and which integrates the state (protected area) as having an interest in participating, which can take risks to assume that the state would be interested in participating. Arrangements are minimal from my vision. The proposal is excellent.

Evidence B: The concept is clear and the objectives are attainable.

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 design of the project is articulated to address threats.

Evidence B: The project shows convincingly ways to address threats in a positive way.

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: It is not clear how the budget will be determined, but the design is limited and unclear scope, thus, missing BUDGET OVERRIDE develop.

Evidence B: There is good alignment as this project builds on current work.

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: It is not significant but it's pretty close. 5 projects are presented in association with WCS as cofinancing, as well as several initiatives themselves as an institution.

Evidence B: The project states that it could count with more support from WCS and from the sale of their income generating projects.

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: Indicators arise 2941.840 hectares and more than 8,297 people.

Evidence B: The indicators are well conceived .

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: They are suitable in their presentation and it should be noted that they are aligned to the indicators with indicators of life plans and territorial management plans, which is a fundamental input to align processes of both the project and its instruments of governance.

Evidence B: Yes. The results are well conceived.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: According to the explanation I think it raises far-reaching benefits.

Evidence B: If approved, this project will strengthen a long-term clear vision.

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: According to the description given, they are clearly contributing.

Evidence B: The text explains a clear link to national priorities.

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: The design is not explicit. In the description of the question 15 whether it is clearly justified that should be included and highlighted that indicators should be integrated into the design of the project to monitor and count on funding. This denotes comment technical knowledge of the subject.

Evidence B: This section could be strengthened in the text.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: I think that now focuses on 4 propeusta territories but the organization integrates a10 organizations with which there is potential for strengthening larger scale. I find innovative ways.

Evidence B: Yes. There are several income-generating projects that could be replicated and scaled up.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 37/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 36/40

Average Total Score: 36.5/40

Performance of Eol 176 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: If, CPILAP, indigenous-based regional organization with its 4 territories and will be held with the support of WCS Bolivia.

Evidence B: CPILAP rates high in this category.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: According to the explanation of the processes that have carried out, in addition to initiatives that have been implemented together.

Evidence B: The organization has a long history of struggle and success in Bolivia.

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: This clearly designed who does what and how you will support the work by WCS.

Evidence B: Yes. The proponent has strong links with grassroots organizations that will implement the project.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: WCS support for support arises.

Evidence B: The organization proposed to reach out to other partners to help with technical expertise.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: It is presented that can handle an annual average of 120k.

Evidence B: This part was not clear in the statement, should be strengthened.

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 answered no.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 176 in Andes/Amazon - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

