

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 303

Organization: O Le Siosiomaga Society Incorporated (OLSSI)

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
303	Polynesia	Samoa	23	29	14	66
303	Polynesia	Samoa	21		15	36

Performance of Eol 303 in Polynesia - 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: Samoa has an important levels of biodiversity with a number of endemic species. Project addresses and aims to protect mangrove forests, which are under significant threat in the country. At a general level Samoa, and Pacific SIDS have some of the highest rates of biodiversity loss in the world. The mangrove forests targeted in this proposal are under significant threat from a range of activities.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: Mangrove forests are very important for climate change mitigation in Samoa. They are among the best carbon sinks as their above ground and underground biomass supports carbon sequestration.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: The project areas are held and managed under strong and active IPLC governance systems. All mangrove forests targeted in this project are held under the customary land tenure system of Samoa and are under the trusteeship of the council of chiefs in each village which is the supreme authority in a Samoa village community. Each of the targeted villages in the EOI has sovereign cultural control over the mangrove forests that form part of its traditional lands.

Evidence B: in theory and traditionally the areas are held under IPLC governance systems but these have been weakening for decades

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: Mangrove forests have strong cultural significance in Samoa and are a major part of the natural assets of Samoan coastal villages. Traditionally mangroves have provided very important natural and cultural services, including for sources of protein, (fishes and all edible marine animals), and as a source of medicinal material, used by traditional healers as an alternative for many local community members who are too poor to see the doctors or to buy modern medicine. Mangroves have served an important traditional function for extracting dye from mangrove bark for making tapa cloth, which is very important in Samoa for making cultural artefacts and clothing.

Evidence B: NA

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

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The mangrove forests in the EOI face serious threats on multiple fronts. Threats are well documented in the proposal and include: (a) Unsustainable habitat loss and fragmentation; (b) Exotic invasive species; (c) Overfishing; (d) Urbanisation; and (e) Climate Change

Evidence B: unsustainable harvesting for firewood and timber; weakening of traditional (village-based) governance and control of communal assets; climate change esp sea level rise and more intense storms; invasive species; coastal development for urban and infrastructure construction; habitat degradation and fragmentation; pollution

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: Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance. There is a strong and effective system of IPLC governance in Samoa, based at the village level, with governance applied through the of the council of chiefs in each village.

Evidence B: National biodiversity legislation (4 laws) and 9 policies (eg the Biodiversity Conservation Policy) are supportive and aligned with the project ecological and cultural objectives. The EOI is however not specific about how these support IPLC governance. In fact the EOI states that mangrove decline continues despite all these laws and policies.. On the positive side, Samoa has chosen to blend traditional customary law and practices with Western law and policy. This has resulted in a more participatory protection regime that has both the support of traditional landowners and the Samoan government. This has only been made possible because of Samoa's progressive attitudes towards traditional landowners and customary law. a deliberate government policy which utilises basic provisions in the national environmental legislation. Arguably, the linchpin of the system is the empowerment of the village Fono and formal legal recognition of traditional customs and practices under the Fono Act (from Techera, E. (2006). Samoa: Law, custom and conservation. New Zealand Journal of Environmental Law, 10, 361–380.) For mangrove ecosystems however the Constitution provides that the land below the high-water mark is public land, owned and controlled by the Government. This clearly complicates mangrove governance and decision-making.

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: The Samoan Government is engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC- led conservation. IPLC governance is reinforced by effective national legislation and systems, including through the Samoa Ministry of natural Resources and Environment. There is an effective national policy framework which reinforces IPLC governance, including the Biodiversity Conservation Policy, and the Land Use Policy.

Evidence B: In general the national government actively promotes IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation. Development pressures however intersect with these objectives

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: There have been IPLC led activities within mangrove forests in the project sites for many years. The project would reinforce and build on these activities.

Evidence B: local bans on over harvesting are being managed by local village communities. The EOI is not clear on the extent to which these are IPLC led, but they do offer a basis for scaling up.

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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Some complementary projects outlined in the EOI. A number of existing and potential partners are also identified, including the National Uni. Of Samoa (NUS), the University of the South Pacific (USP): and the relevant Government agency (MNRE)

*Evidence B:*they is little elaboration of complementary projects, rather there is mention of several small local complementary activities


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 303 in Polynesia - 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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There is a very strong alignment with the objectives of ICI to enhance Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' (IPLCs) efforts to steward land, waters and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits. This alignment reflects the strong system of IPLC governance in Samoa

Evidence B:NA

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: NA/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The EOI includes a clear and relevant set of activities and results. The approach appears logical and effective

Evidence B:NA

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: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The project identifies the threats faced by mangroves in Samoa and will address these threats through community led action, reinforced by support from the relevant government agencies, MNRE

*Evidence B:*NA

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Activities/results appear well aligned with Eol range of investment

*Evidence B:*NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Co-financing arrangements are not clear from the project proposal

*Evidence B:*NA

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: NA/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Total area under improved management is estimated as 125,000 ha

*Evidence B:*NA

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Long and short term indicators are outlined in the EOI. Short-term indicators: these can be identified when the project ends and the first few years that follow. Cultural indicators are outlined in the project proposal, including those relating to traditional fishing methods

*Evidence B:*NA

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The emphasis on sustainability is linked to IPLC engagement and involvement throughout the project

Evidence B: NA

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: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The EOI is strongly linked with national policies and programmes relating to biodiversity conservation and sustainable development, including those outlined in Samoa's NBSAP

Evidence B: NA

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Gender mainstreaming is included within the proposal, in particular to be achieved through working with village Women Committees, and other community structures, reporting to the Matai council where appropriate policies and village by-laws are developed and approved for the long-term tenure of the mangrove biodiversity.

Evidence B: NA

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: NA/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/40

Reviewer B Total Score: NA/40

Average Total Score: 29/40

Performance of Eol 303 in Polynesia - 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: This project involves IPLCs particularly through traditional village structures. It appears to be an IPLC led approach

Evidence B: The organisation is a membership based environmental NGO that leads several IPLC projects

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: EOI demonstrates on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work

Evidence B: the EOI has limited demonstration of on-ground leadership. One of its references of past work suggest involvement in community participation and consultation as part of a broader 12 month project

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Project demonstrates strong IPLC partnerships, working with and through traditional village structures in Samoa to ensure effective mangrove protection.

Evidence B: There is a vague reference to village communities as partner organisations, with limited explanation of their roles - 'assisting field surveys and providing traditional knowledge'. Little additional information is provided.

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Skills of the lead organisation and proposed staff are relevant to the planning and implementation of this project. Previous GEF experience is outlined, including with the Strengthening Multi-Sectoral Management of Critical Landscapes (SMSMCL) project that secured USD\$5million for the Government of Samoa. (completed in January 2020.)

Evidence B: The proponent's staff have a great deal of experience in relevant fields, but the EOI is vague and unconvincing on activities and the required skills to deliver the outcomes being sought.

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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Moderate capacity outlined in the EOI

Evidence B: The organisation does not appear to have strong capacity for project and financial management. The two projects referenced were both of 12 months duration only.

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: Yes, experience through previous work with GEF

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 15/30

Average Total Score: 14.5/30

Performance of Eol 303 in Polynesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

