

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 274

Organization: CONSEJO DE CAPITANIAS GUARANIS DE CHUQUISACA (CCCH)

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Estebancio Castro Díaz	274	Gran Chaco	Bolivia	18	25	22	65
Alejandro Herrera	274	Gran Chaco	Bolivia	19	24	23	66
Leonardo, Crippa	274	Gran Chaco	Bolivia	18	24	22	64

Performance of Eol 274 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: 3/5 Reviewer C: 4/5*

**Average: 3.67/5**

*Evidence A:* The document submitted by the interested parties, presents the territory / landscape / seascape proposed is a globally important area for biodiversity, indigenous peoples and climate benefits.

*Evidence B:* This is a proposal for trinational territories of the Gran Chaco

*Evidence C:* Indigenous territory located in Gran Chaco region. Connection with protected areas and national parks in three countries, including Bolivia, Argentina, and Paraguay.

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

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

**Average: 1.33/2**

*Evidence A:* According to the document submitted by the interested parties, the proposed area has a high significance for climate change mitigation.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* Most of project area coincides or is located next to a forest.

### 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 Reviewer C: 1/2*

**Average: 2.33/5**

*Evidence A:* The document does not present or is not fully comprehensive if communities in the region use their system of governance but indicates a degree of recognition of indigenous communities either agricultural system or other mechanisms.

*Evidence B:* The governance situation is different among the three countries, with the case of Bolivia the most promising in this regard

*Evidence C:* Project area in Bolivia is clearly held and managed by the Guarani People. But it is not clear whether the project area in Argentina and Paraguay is held by the Guarani and Usher Peoples. The indigenous governance seems to be affected by lack of legal security over the lands in question and existing land conflicts.

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

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* The proposal presents no explanation given of unique importance for indigenous peoples. However, vaguely it refers to the region as a site of importance to their lands, territories and resources.

*Evidence B:* NA

*Evidence C:* Answer to question 2 highly focused in governance. Cultural attachment to the land has been stated but not in great detail.

### 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 Reviewer C: 2/5*

**Average: 3.33/5**

*Evidence A:* According to the initiative by the parties concerned, the area is very vulnerable to threats / current risk of negative impacts for indigenous peoples and biodiversity without action. For example, to name a few threats, we have the expansion of the agricultural frontier, the expanding livestock farm, illegally acquiring land, deforestation of native forests and others.

*Evidence B:* The evidence provided about the threats affecting the Gran Chaco is blunt and truthful

*Evidence C:* Threats include cattle raising and land grabbing.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* The document concerned does not have the legal framework of importance for indigenous peoples in the region to allow political conditions. However, the tabular support resource shows that there is a legal and political framework that can allow the necessary conditions for conservation is led by indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:* The situation of one or other organizations may be quite different in each country, there is not even a line to respect

*Evidence C:* The countries' existing domestic laws and policies are encouraging. In some cases, domestic laws embrace a strong protective approach to stop evictions of indigenous communities lacking land title as a means to stop land grabbing.

## 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 Reviewer C: 2/3*

### **Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The tabular support resource shows that there is a legal and political framework that can support the initiative of indigenous peoples but with limitations. Similarly, the document concerned, mentioned in a general way some initiatives that have been supporting the government.

*Evidence B:* The situation differs from country to country, but overall great support not warn

*Evidence C:* Regional programs focusing in the Gran Chaco region and existing national conservation policies and programs seems to be supportive of indigenous-led conservation. However, no information has been provided about programs at the sub-national or local level.

## 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: 0/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

### **Average: 1/3**

*Evidence A:* The document in your question 4 and 5, does not provide much information on when current projects. However, the projects mentioned much protected areas in the region. Thus, no successful conservation initiatives led by the indigenous peoples in the area proposed to provide a base for expanding

*Evidence B:* There is no evidence to respect. The above initiatives are state-protected wild areas initiative.

*Evidence C:* Indigenous-lead initiatives exist in the countries concerned. There seems to be strong involvement of indigenous organizations in government's initiatives as well.

## 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 Reviewer C: 1/3*

**Average: 1.33/2**

*Evidence A:* The information given by the parties concerned and the support resource tabular shown that projects / complementary investments align strongly with the objectives of the project and investments are substantial.

*Evidence B:* apparently, it is limited in scope projects

*Evidence C:* Various relevant projects have been mentioned. But it is not clear whether they cover the entire area of this particular project. The information does not state the location of all listed projects.

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 18.33/30

Performance of Eol 274 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 3/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* The document submitted by the interested parties shows that the proposed approach is aligned well with the overall objective of the ICI: Improve efforts of indigenous peoples to manage land, water and natural resources to provide global environmental benefits

*Evidence B:*EOI proposes strategies reasonably related to the objectives of ICI

*Evidence C:*Project lead and co-managers are indigenous organizations. Project activities and goals mostly focused on governance, conservation monitoring and forest restoration.

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 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* It is very interesting the proposal of the document concerned and activities and expected results are well defined. However, the presentation is not clear in your document. Desclosar a little need for a comprehensive understanding.

*Evidence B:*It is needed to clarify the relationship between implementing organizations in a tri-national and territorial regulatory framework

*Evidence C:*Project activities and goals are clear. It would be advisable to require clarifications on how project activities can help gain legal security over lands in Argentina and Paraguay as it seems to undermine overall governance.



### 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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 1/3*

**Average: 1.67/3**

*Evidence A:* The project will contribute according to their document identify current and future threats allowing indigenous peoples lead our conservation.

*Evidence B:* Should review the proposed activities

*Evidence C:* Gaining legal security over lands can help overcome threats. But it is not clear how the project can help overcome it, especially in Argentina and Bolivia. Needs further explanation.

### 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: 1/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 1.67/3**

*Evidence A:* According to the document submitted by the interested parties, the activities can be achieved within a budget range of \$ 500,000 to \$ 2,000,000 USD over a period of 5 years of implementation of the project.

*Evidence B:* Some actions may require more time.

*Evidence C:* The proposed activities can certainly be achieved within the project period. Project partners can help project lead and co-managers to do so.

### 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 Reviewer C: 2/3*

### **Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The document provides information on co-financing and donors. However, no specific numbers gives the amount of co-financing.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*About 9 sources of co-financing are listed. Question 7 was not clearly answered. No clear information about the potential of other co-financing sources.

## **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: 3/5 Reviewer C: 3/5*

### **Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* The answer to question 12 of the document indicates that this moderate global environmental benefits.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*The project lead's contributions are key. They make this project's benefits substantial and realistic.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The answer to question 13 is very general although results cultural and lifestyle derived from the objectives of the project.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Unfortunately, the answer to question 13 is not clear. It could be improved to better comprehend the additional cultural and livelihoods results, which I believe do exist and will play a role in helping achieve project goals.

**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: 1/3 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 1.67/3**

*Evidence A:* The answer to question 16 of the document indicates that the long-term sustainability will depend on the development of the same project and hence the future financing will be built.

*Evidence B:*There is no evidence for long-term sustainability of the proposal

*Evidence C:*Long-term sustainability has not been clearly addressed. Seems that question 16 was not clearly understood.

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

**Average: 1.33/3**

*Evidence A:* The document in its response 14 does not provide direct information on contributions to national priorities in relation to NBSAP and NDC.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:* Neither the contributions nor the NBSAPs/NDCs are clearly stated. Needs further clarifications.

#### 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 Reviewer C: 2/3*

**Average: 2.33/3**

*Evidence A:* EoI document provides a moderate approach to the gender perspective.

*Evidence B:* The project is clear and well-founded criteria regarding gender mainstreaming.

*Evidence C:* Relevant gender mainstreaming has been taken into account in both decision-making and project activities.

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

**Average: 2.33/5**

*Evidence A:* The document presented has proposed activities potentially high for a transformative future scale and innovation.

*Evidence B:* of the action plan and goals of the project they seem overstated.

*Evidence C:* Indigenous organizations play a leading role in this project. Project partners includes NGOs that can help ensure and painting such leadership throughout the project period.

## Section 2:


*Reviewer A Total Score: 25/40*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 24/40*

*Reviewer C Total Score: 24/40*

**Average Total Score: 24.33/40**

Performance of Eol 274 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 5.33/6**

*Evidence A:* According to the document, the proposed project is composed and has completely focus led by indigenous peoples.

*Evidence B:*EOI is conducted by a trinational group of indigenous communities and organizations of the same nation for execution.

*Evidence C:*The project lead and partners are indigenous organizations connected to indigenous grass-root organizations in the countries concerned. Project partners include NGOs that play a supportive role.

### 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: 4/6 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* The document in general shows that there is an important leadership in the field of the proposed work.

*Evidence B:*The experience of the parent organization, the projects implemented earlier, and the ability to trinational organization favors the leadership of the main implementing organization.

*Evidence C:*The project lead and partners are indigenous organizations connected to indigenous grass-root organizations in the countries concerned. Project partners include NGOs that play a supportive role.

### 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 3/5 Reviewer C: 5/5*

**Average: 4.33/5**

*Evidence A:* Answer to Question 21 of the document shows that there is strong associations of indigenous peoples who have a central role in the design, governance and implementation of the project and links with networks of organizations of national or regional indigenous peoples

*Evidence B:* Trinational proposal suggests close ties between organizations.

*Evidence C:* Lead proponent and co-managers are well-connected and attached to the land. The inter-connection that exists amongst them is key to carry out the project activities.

### 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5 Reviewer C: 4/5*

**Average: 3.67/5**

*Evidence A:* The document reflects that they have adequate skills and capacity for the project, but have no experience with GEF projects and their current and past projects are more about topic of education and human rights.

*Evidence B:* The main implementing organization has a long history in time, has administrative technical team, and plan to improve their technical skills.

*Evidence C:*Project partners selected to ensure technical capacity. Lead proponent has no GEF project experience.

#### 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: 6/6 Reviewer C: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* The document shows that there is some capacity but will require support in the future

*Evidence B:*In general, their previous projects exceed the amounts required

*Evidence C:*Project lead with such capacity. However, answers to question 26 are confusing and provide no clarity about co-manager's capacity. Clarification is needed.

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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/2 Reviewer C: 1/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* If you went to the answer to question 28 but missed a more detailed explanation of it.

*Evidence B:*He does not have experience working with GEF above, although they have had with other major international donors.

*Evidence C:*The answer was yes. But it requires further explanation.



### Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30*

*Reviewer C Total Score: 22/30*

**Average Total Score: 22.33/30**

Performance of Eol 274 in Gran Chaco - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

