

## FP057 - Climate Action for Rural Development: CBA and mitigation in Argentina (Argentina/UCAR)

---

### *CSO comments on the project given as intervention during the 18<sup>th</sup> GCF Board Meeting, October 2017*

We welcome this new proposal as the second EDA project and hope to see more EDA projects in the future. We also received positive feedback from local groups.

- We support the idea of this project, which emphasises indigenous communities and 'family'-scale agriculture, focused on this type of agriculture as a leading production model based on agro-ecology.
- However, we would like to see stronger language providing assurance that multi-stakeholder engagement, including with indigenous peoples, will take place. We therefore have the following comments and concerns:
- We welcome that UCAR, as focal point of the accredited entity, will include two representatives of indigenous peoples communities (one man and one woman). However, it is not clear how these representatives will be identified and selected.
- The project states that for the evaluation of projects involving indigenous peoples, a representative of the Indigenous Peoples Council of the National Institute of Indigenous Matters will be invited, or in its stead a representative of the provincial authority. This language is discretionary and does not ensure that the perspectives of potentially affected communities will be duly reflected in the project evaluation.
- The proposal recognises that indigenous peoples are among those most vulnerable to climate change, and thus proposes a mitigation and adaptation program with a conservation approach. However, the proposal does not acknowledge the potential positive contribution of indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and livelihoods.
- The proposal specifies that information, participation, and consultation will take place every time the action affects indigenous peoples' rights in accordance with the ESMF. It should be noted that Argentina ratified ILO169 in 1992, has legislation on Indigenous peoples, and voted in favour of UNDRIP. Hence, the consultation processes must apply FPIC in line with ILO169 and UNDRIP. This is not stated anywhere in the proposal.

**Note:** *As there was no consensus in the board, this project was not approved, although CSOs, as evidenced by the comments, supported it strongly.*