

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 139

Organization: Te Ipukarea Society Incorporated

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
139	Melanesia/ Polynesia	Cook Islands	26	23	23	72
139	Melanesia/ Polynesia	Cook Islands	22	22	23	67

Performance of Eol 139 in Melanesia/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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Suvarrow National Park is an Important Bird Area and a breeding site for migratory bird species. It also an important area for globally threatened marine migratory species including whales, sharks, turtles and rays.

Evidence B: According to the CI database, the National Park of Suvarrow is a key biodiversity area, ranked at High Significance, not only for the purpose of bird conservation but also protection and preservation of ecosystems in oceans and sea.

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: NA/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: As an ocean dominated country the Cook Islands contributes to climate mitigation. This however may be endangered by deep sea mining in the future.

Evidence B: No data is available to estimate the importance of the area for climate mitigation neither in the CI database nor the Eol.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The population of the Cook Islands as a whole is Indigenous and no conservation initiative led by the government or NGOs occurs without consultation with and approval by traditional leaders. Te Ipukarea Society is managed by Indigenous peoples. Suvarrow is not inhabited.

Evidence B: Even though the EoI recognises the importance of IPLCs engagement and provides a few references in this regard, it does not present an IPLCs activate role or concrete information regarding IPLC governance systems.

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: There is no specific description about Cook Islanders' cultural or historical relationship with Suvarrow. The proposal emphasizes only the customary approach to conservation through ra'ui which continues to be practiced today.

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: Ongoing threats to the island include invasive species; fishing gear, including FADs that wash up on Suvarrow and impact surrounding ocean area; impacts of climate change and potential deep sea mining.

Evidence B: These threats include: Mainly tourism impacts, habitat loss and deterioration, land conversion and unsustainable land use, unsustainable harvesting of wild resources, fire, climate change (sea and ambient temperatures).

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: This proposal supports ongoing conservation efforts by the Government and communities of the Cook Islands such as the Marae Moana in which traditional leaders in Cook Islands are actively involved. It will also support the role of Indigenous rangers who monitor the island.

Evidence B: According to the CI database (Landmark), "The Crown formally recognizes and protects rights of traditional landowners through legislation. The Cook Islands Act prohibits alienation of customary land, whether to Cook Islanders or others." Beyond a prohibition on alienation, the dimensions of those rights are not clear, and there is not further information referred to in the EOI.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Conservation in the Cook Islands requires collaboration between the national government and traditional leadership. The Marae Moana Marine Park establishment cemented the collaboration between national government, island councils (which include traditional authorities) and the House of Ariki which brings together the traditional chiefs of all of the Cook Islands.

Evidence B: The CI database provides relevant information which exemplifies the support provided by national and sub-national governments for IPLC-led conservation in the country. On the other hand, the EoI presents broad information about government intervention and active support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area.

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: The Marae Moana Marine Park establishment in 2017 was the culmination of ongoing work in conservation by Cook Islanders for Cook Islanders.

Evidence B: NA

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: The proposal lists a number of projects which can dovetail with and support this initiative.

Evidence B: NA


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 139 in Melanesia/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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: TIS is led by Indigenous peoples and this project will support improved Cook Islands' management of Suvarrow National Park.

*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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: The proposal has clear objectives and anticipated results but it should indicate more clearly how the project can contribute to educational and cultural outcomes.

*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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The ambitions are realistic but it is not altogether clear what type of ecotourism can/should be developed and how this will contribute to fostering cultural values and educational opportunities.

*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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Based on the Marae Moana park establishment, the investment seems realistic and feasible.

*Evidence B:*There is not enough development of the set of project activities and well-defined range of investment. The activities/objectives are vaguely described.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: It proposes in-kind contributions only.

*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: 5/5 Reviewer B: NA/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Considering the marine area protection which is above 1,000,000 hectares, and the numbers of beneficiaries, the benefits can be considered very high.

Evidence B: No data available, neither in the CI database nor the EoI, to estimate (GEF core indicators) substantially 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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: These are not articulated. The proposal just makes references to ecotourism.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The project fits in well with Marae Moana marine park and other ongoing initiatives but the proposal could be more explicit.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The project is clearly related to NBSAPs but the proposal doesn't mention NDCs and doesn't provide sufficient details.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The EOI does not give much emphasis to gender mainstreaming.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Establishment of a biosphere will be beneficial to the Cook Islands and help reinforce conservation efforts but the EOI doesn't emphasise specifically or in detail how this will benefit the people of Cook Islands as a whole and result in transformation beyond Suvarrow itself.

*Evidence B:*NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/40

Average Total Score: 22.5/40

Performance of Eol 139 in Melanesia/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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: TIS is an Indigenous organization.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: TIS has been a leading conservation organization and has the demonstrated ability to carry out the work.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: this section of the proposal is incomplete which is strange as clearly TIS has worked with other IPLCs.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: TIS has prior GEF project experience through small grants.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: It meets 2 out of 3 criteria and close to 3 as it has one project worth 200,000USD.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Answer proves explanation.

*Evidence B:*NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 139 in Melanesia/Polynesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

