

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 225

Organization: Volenteers for Village Development

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Jennifer Rubis	225	Himalayas	India	21	28	19	68
Yance Arizona	225	Himalayas	India	25	32	23	80

Performance of Eol 225 in Himalayas - 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: While the area is not listed as a key biodiversity area in accordance with the resources allocated, WWF lists it as an ecoregion with “the the highest bird species richness of all ecoregions that are completely within the Indo-Pacific region.”

Evidence B: The proposed area is Naga indigenous territory located in India and Myanmar. The proposed location is a key biodiversity area with high range of species rarity and intact forest landscape.

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: In accordance with the spatial resources provided

Evidence B: The applicant does not describe potential carbon stock in the proposed location, but geospatial data indicated that the proposed location contain high carbon density.

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: While the proposal goes into some detail on the historical origins of the state structure in Nagaland, it also provides evidence of the existing Naga traditional governance system

Evidence B: The proposed location is maintained by indigenous peoples, but they encounter some limitations from the government.

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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant clearly explained the significance of the project site for IPLCs

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 proposal lists the following threats: mass tourism; Influx of immigrants and land grabbing; Incoherent government policies; land degradation and Thinning of forest; drying of springs

Evidence B: The proposed location faces some threats include land grabbing, land degradation, influx of immigrant, and unplanned tourism. Geospatial data also indicated high forest change in the proposed location.

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposal states that India North-east states have constitutional provisions, including the formation of a separate Hill Area Committee. However the State government has no adequate resources dedicated to the hill states.

Evidence B: The government of India has been enacting some supportive regulation for promotion of IPLC-led conservation, but it is lack in implementation.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: cf answer to Q6

Evidence B: National and sub-national government have implemented some supports for IPLC-led conservation.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant has describe some successful pilot project in the proposed area. Therefore this project is beyond building a case study for IPLC-led conservation.

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: NA

Evidence B: The applicant listed many potential collaboration of the proposed activities with existing programs under the applicant, Moreover, the applicant also indicates some potential collaboration with other NGOs to mobilize resource to implement the project.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 225 in Himalayas - 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: NA

Evidence B: The proposed project is exceptionally aligned with the overall objective of the ICI to enhance UPLCs efforts to steward land and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits.

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 logic linking the series of activities to be conducted to the overall goal of stewardship of water, land and natural resources is not well elaborated in the proposal.

Evidence B: The proposed activities and results are well defined and cohesive but some aspect require detailed explanation and clarification.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The proposed activities intended to strengthen IPLC institutions and economic activities at the rural level. This strategy can increase IPLCs' control to territory, but it is not clearly described how these activities can prevent land grabbing, land degradation, influx of immigrant.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: the proposed activities and results are exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant has many programs that can support the implementation of the proposed activities.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The protected area is 1.246.300 ha, but landscape under improved practices is 20.000 ha. Potential beneficiaries is 400 villages.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Additional cultural and livelihoods results are directed from the proposed activities.

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: NA

Evidence B: The applicant has permanent funding such as BftW and ICCO that have been supporting the applicant more than two decades. The result of the proposed activities than is not a long-term sustainable IPLC-led conservation. To reach that goal is require another project after the proposed project accomplished.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The proposed projects is well aligned with NBSAP and NDCs of the Government of India,

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*The proposed project is very sensitive with women participation. Some special activities are directed to empower women in decision-making process.

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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*The proposed project provide high potential transformative result.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 30/40

Performance of Eol 225 in Himalayas - 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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant is an indigenous led organisation and work partially with NGOs in implementing activities to support indigenous peoples in Nagaland

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

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant is an indigenous led organisation with long history of supporting indigenous peoples in the region.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Strong IPLC partnerships have a central role in design, governance and implementation of the project and linkages with local and national NGOs.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Staff in the organisation have adequate skills and capacity for the project but do not have experience with GEF 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The annual budget of the applicant is USD 216.216 and this amount indicated that the applicant has provided good capacity to implement the proposed project.

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: NA/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant has internal financial policy and use Tally accounting sisyem which is most accepted accounting standards in India.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 225 in Himalayas - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

