

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 395

Organization: Fisheries Action Coalition Team (FACT)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Helen Tugendhat	395	South East Asia (mainland)	Cambodia	18	26	13	57
Yance Arizona	395	South East Asia (mainland)	Cambodia	26	29	16	71

Performance of Eol 395 in South East Asia (mainland) - 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: wetlands, Tonle Sap, and KBA areas.

Evidence B: The proposed location is Tonle Sap lake, which is one of crucial for species rarity. The proposed location is home for 250 to 350 diverse fish species. However, this location is not high in term of intact forest landscape and key biodiversity areas.

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: flood plain of Tonle Sap is v high carbon sink.

Evidence B: The applicant does not state the potential carbon stock of the proposed location, but spatial resource indicated that the proposed location is covered with 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Not clearly explained, but two main areas (around Tonle Sap, and up in the Sesan valley) are not titled, occupancy continues and rights are claimed, not recognised.

Evidence B: The proposed area is home to indigenous peoples of Cambodia. But potential resource from the Tonle Sap lake is contested among various actors for various purposes. This condition limits the IPLC access to exercise strong governance system.

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: NA

Evidence B: The proposed location has unique cultural significant for the IPLCs, because many of them rely on natural resources of the Tonle Sap lake. IPLCs also perceived the lake along with forest and water as part of their cultural identity. This relation is clearly explain in the EoI.

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: Climate, over-fishing, dams, pollution, low organisational maturity in commune and group level all named.

Evidence B: The proposed location encounter threat mainly from hydro-power dams and environmental pollution. Another threat is illegal fishing and deforestation. Geo spatial data indicates that the location is not under the highest development pressure and serious forest change.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Very limited rights, but fishery use and management have stronger recognition than forest and terrestrial rights.

Evidence B: The government of Cambodia enacted Fisheries Law and operational regulation for accommodating community fisheries management. Several projects are also taking place to encourage the government involved in strengthening community based natural resource management.

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: Support for fishery management, at Tonle Sap and marine areas, but it is use and conservation in specific sites.

Evidence B: The government established Fish Conservation Area in the location based on NGO's advocacy in this location, including the applicant.

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: Beyond pilot in fishery user groups, not in forest areas.

Evidence B: The applicant had achieved several milestones to implement a new project in the location. These achievements include 55 Community Fisheries (CFIs) and Fish Conservation Areas. These achievements are beyond pilot project and the proposed activities can strengthen and expand existing initiatives.

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: 2/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Big but tangentially related, more conservation than a focus on IPLC conservation and rights.

Evidence B: the proposed project is strongly aligned with previous activities of the applicant and this investment will substantially complement the effort to strengthen IPLC-led conservation.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 395 in South East Asia (mainland) - 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Aligned in improving efforts to steward and manage waters and resources, but an approach which relies on administratively modern 'user groups' largely separated from cultural governance.

Evidence B: The project proposed well aligned with the IPLCs' effort to steward land, waters 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: Strong, clear theory of change and convincing activities, but for community fishery management, not IPLC conservation

Evidence B: The proposed activities are comprehensive including empowering IPLC's capacity, conservation, livelihood, and documentation. The applicant has list the detailed activities but, this is not include the expected outcomes and how these outcomes will complement each others.

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: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The project addresses the threats, but does not put into place enabling conditions for IPLC leadership on conservation

Evidence B: Strengthening IPLC-led conservation will improve the community control to the lake and its resources. This effort will support to reduce illegal fishing, but these activities is not strongly linked to tackle hydropower dam project that is also identified as a main threat in this EoI.

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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The proposed activities listed in the EoI are comprehensive and these activities are well aligned with the range of investment.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;

- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant has indicated some potential co-financing for the proposed activities from past project and from the government support.

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: 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: total area of all communes and fishery areas is v high - over 2 million ha

Evidence B: The proposed location consists of 99,435.58 hectares including terrestrial and marine areas.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Very little description, but livelihoods are central. Additional cultural indicators not present.

Evidence B: The proposed activities is aligned to IPLC's livelihood, but this detail information is not provide in this section.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: On-going support from commune and central government, plus increased capacity

Evidence B: The proposed project indicated potential long-term sustainability because of a strong commitment and financial support from the government to IPLC in fisheries activities.

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: Clearly relates to MDGs, national fishery development plans, etc., including conservation of fishery stocks

Evidence B: The proposed project is well aligned with the national programs such as the Strategic Planning Framework for Fisheries 2010-2019 and other relevant government policies.

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: A challenging context, clearly described. Main strategy is to promote women's leadership but no description of how.

Evidence B: The applicant assumes that Cambodian women and men have the same opportunity for education. In this project, the applicant will ensure 30% of women participation.

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: Demonstrated scale within the areas described, over time, covering marine and riverine areas in Cambodia.

Evidence B: The proposed project is beyond pilot projects. It means that some IPLCs have been established and this proposed project will strengthen the existing pilot projects to demonstrate transformative result.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 27.5/40

Performance of Eol 395 in South East Asia (mainland) - 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: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: Unclear, no IPLC partners or at least not clearly the case. Indigenous staff identified.

Evidence B: The proposed project is designed to be implemented by NGOs, and IPLCs will be beneficiaries of these activities. One of the objective of this project is to build IPLC capacity in conservation and natural resource managements.

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: Strong experience in project activities, but not related to IPLC conservation

Evidence B: The applicant has working with other NGOs and 55 active IPLCs to implement the proposed activities.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant has working with other NGOs and 55 active IPLCs to implement the proposed activities.

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: The applicant and its partners have adequate skills and capacity for the project but they do not have experience with GEF projects

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: NA

*Evidence B:*The applicant annual budget is quite high USD 800.000 to 1.000.000. The applicant maintain project from more than 5 donor agencies.

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: 13/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 14.5/30

Performance of Eol 395 in South East Asia (mainland) - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

