

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 317

Organization: PERKUMPULAN KARSA

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Helen Tugendhat	317	South East Asia (Islands)	Indonesia	20	26	14	60
Yance Arizona	317	South East Asia (Islands)	Indonesia	25	26	12	63

Performance of Eol 317 in South East Asia (Islands) - 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: Peat forest in kalimantan (central), not KBA, but orangutan habitat and under high threat.

Evidence B: The proposed project location is located in key biodiversity area and high intact forest landscape. The area is home of many plants and animals, including Orangutan.

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: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Irrecoverable Carbon map data not available, project proposal details high carbon stocks.

Evidence B: The area contains 187.069.833 tons of CO₂. This is exceptional carbon stock in the region.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Under 'social forestry' designation allowing continued use. Strong local governance described.

Evidence B: The proposed area is maintained by Dayak tribe, but they have lack of legal status because the government designated the area as a national park area which is prohibited human activities. However, some part of the area has been designated by the government to include in the indicative maps of the social forestry. It means that the government agency begins to acknowledge IPLC conservation and natural resource management practices.

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: Clear, although short.

Evidence B: The proposed project location is culturally significant for the IPLC, especially for the Kaharingan tribe who remain practicing local beliefs.

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Oil palm, deforestation, fires, climate change and drying out of peat, clear and significant threats are present.

Evidence B: The proposed project area faces various threats. It includes the cumulative development pressures, forest change, and this area also surrounded by variety of corporate's concession such as oil palm concession. The area also encounter illegal logging and forest fires.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: In this particular province, a number of positive policy instruments exist towards increased conservation and involvement of communities. not equal to land rights recognition, but improved security of access and high conservation values.

Evidence B: The national government promoted several schemes to include IPLC natural resource management system within forest area. This social forestry policy will be implemented in forest areas which is designated in the indicative maps (PIAP). The proposed project area has included in he PIAP.

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: To an extent. Existing protected areas are significant in size, involvement in their management and increased control over buffer zones is targeted.

Evidence B: The provincial government has provided a provincial regulation on the importance of indigenous communities' land recognition. This is in line with the implementation of the national policies on social forestry and the new village law. The government also released a moratorium on plantation permit that would reduce threat to the proposed project 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: High in number and small in scope, largely village level initiatives, and village networks. Beyond pilot but still small in scale.

Evidence B: The EoI does not state clearly the past IPLC-led conservation, but it mentions about a good collaboration with the local government to support IPLC natural resource management and climate change mitigation through REDD+

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: Existing projects are tangentially related to the target of empowering indigenous-led conservation, but existing projects are large and conservation focused.

Evidence B: The applicant mentions about the national park's projects, the local NGO partner and a company's project to support the implementation of this proposed activities. However, the applicant did not clearly state how these programs would support the proposed activities through ICI.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 317 in South East Asia (Islands) - 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: Very clear description of indigenous led concepts and plans to exert and claim higher levels of control and authority.

Evidence B: The proposal is exceptionally well aligned with the objective of the ICI

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: Logic good, scale small

Evidence B: The proposed activities are not clearly defined and lack of connection with expected result of this project.

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: Logical theory of change and will lead to restoration, conservation and improved livelihoods, in the villages involved, but they are small in scale.

Evidence B: The contribution of the project is over-ambitious and to some extent is not address the main threats. Nevertheless, the objective of the activities to strengthen the IPLC role in conservation will indirectly contribute to overcome the identified threats.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: At the low end of the scope.

Evidence B: The proposed activities are not detail. Therefore some improvement would reach the range of investment.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Village level contributions and possible continued district funding.

Evidence B: The proposal mentions that co-financing from village and district government, but this information is not sufficiently provided in the proposal.

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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: the estimate benefits is quite ambitious to reach area of restored land for 100.000 hectares while actual area under improved practices is 23.000 hectares. However, estimate number of direct beneficiaries is 15,000 people is 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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Livelihood is a strong component, cultural indicators less so. Livelihood is linked to project goals of more sustainable management in buffer zones.

Evidence B: The project objectives are contribute to provide additional benefits in term of cultural and livelihoods.

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: Sustainable with on-going government support, and/or new donors. Strong description of institutional sustainability through capacity building.

Evidence B: This project will create partnership among IPLC and local government to continue activities. But is not clear in what form of the partnership would be created. Further project and funding is required for creating long-term sustainability.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Strongly aligned to provincial and national stated objectives.

Evidence B: The proposed project is in line with the national and sub-national policies and project to support IPLC role in natural resources management and climate change mitigation.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Strongly described.

Evidence B: A women's group to process fish into follow-up products has established and women participation is significant in the implementation of the projects.

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Low to moderate. Impacts largely local to the 4 villages named, and to the protected areas nearby by.

Evidence B: The proposal does not indicate potential scale up or replication of existing practice. But this proposal indicated potential policy intervention to strengthen IPLC tenure security in natural resource managements.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/40

Average Total Score: 26/40

Performance of Eol 317 in South East Asia (Islands) - 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Some NGO involvement, mainly IPLC led

Evidence B: The proposed activities mainly conducted by NGOs, but involving IPLC in the implementation. The IPLC also the main beneficiaries of the proposed project.

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: Demonstrated local leadership, but in limited areas.

Evidence B: The applicant does not provide sufficient information on-ground leadership in this area. While the role of local NGO partner is not clearly defined too.

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: NA

Evidence B: Most of partner listed is not IPLC, but local NGOs who work with IPLC. The division of labor among NGOs and with IPLC is not clearly defined in the proposal.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Not well described.

Evidence B: The leading applicant show relevant past project working with IPLC, especially on village empowerment, social forestry, and land conflicts.

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: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: 1 of 3 (only smaller projects previously, biggest is 133k over 2 years, low diversity of funding - one main donor).

Evidence B: the annual budget of the applicant is less than \$ 200.000 and it might be require an assistance to manage project with bigger budget.

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: NA/2

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 12/30

Average Total Score: 13/30

Performance of Eol 317 in South East Asia (Islands) - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

