

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 24

Organization: Organisation d'Accompagnement et d'Appui aux Pygmées (OSAPY)

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
24	Congo Basin	DR Congo	23	36	24	83
24	Congo Basin	DR Congo	25	20	22	67

Performance of Eol 24 in Congo Basin - 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The area is located precisely in the territory of Kiri in the north of the province of Mai-Ndombe (DRC). It is the landscape of the Lutoy river basin, between the NKOLETULU lake on which flows a chain of several small crisscrossed lakes which constitute the tributaries of Nkoletulu and which form with it a unique seascape and Lake NGOLO. The special one vegetation in the area is dense rainforest. The area has a medium-high Species Range-Size Rarity. It is not a KBA, but part of Intact Forest Landscape.

Evidence B: This area has exceptional forest intactness.

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: The area scores high for Irrecoverable Carbon

Evidence B: The average appears to be higher than 100 t/ha

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: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The land and seascape proposed for the project is since time immemorial maintained under the regime of traditional governance indigenous pygmy peoples. The pygmy community has been protecting this area since time immemorial to keep all of their spiritual and cultural dimension.

Evidence B: The project is aimed at pygmy communities with strong and active IPLC governance in place.

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: This is the place par excellence where they organize cults and solemn rites in honor of the ancestors. This traditional governance is consolidated by a set of rules empowering and disabling, that is to say that impose duties to be performed with regard to these sites and also activities that you absolutely must refrain from when you are on these sites.

Evidence B: The significance is well-articulated, with a focus on spiritual and ancestral importance.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Medium-low cumulative development pressures. Some forest loss. From 2001 to 2018 DRC lost 13.4 Mha of tree cover (6,7% decrease in tree cover since 2000). No land deals in area identified. Eol mentions: Climate change with long periods of drought that decrease very significantly the amount of water in forests and lakes poses a significant threat to the aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity of the area. Pollution of river; fishermen, charcoal burners and poachers enter the area; The involuntary relocation of indigenous peoples is a very persistent threat since the area is full of important resources such as hydrocarbons, copper, iron, etc. At least 31 land defenders killed according to Global Witness between 2016-2018.

Evidence B: This area faces multiple threats, including concessions for timber and mining.

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: The DR Congo's legal framework provides very limited grounds for the recognition of IPLC control over forests. While there is no basis for IPLC ownership or other resources, a long awaited reform may address this (RRI 2020). According to Landmark, 86% of customarily administered lands have yet to be recognized.

Evidence B: The legal framework for protected areas allows for community conserved areas.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There appears to be some willingness in the administration to advance the recognition of IPLC control over forests. The national government has set a target of putting 2.4 Mha of forests under community management by 2023. As of 2020, it had reached half of its targets (RRI, 2020). At the sub-national level, several provincial-level authorities have also expressed an interest in supporting the recognition of IPLC control over forests especially in the provinces of Equateur, Tshuapa, North Kivu, Maniema, Kongo Central, Ituri and Haut Katanga. (RRI 2020). So, not in Mai-Ndombe where the project area is located.

Evidence B: There is limited support and legal framework for IPLC-led work.

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:* 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The Pygmies already are to a certain extent successfully conserving the area for a very long time. The Pygmies keep this area since they are proud of its mega biological diversity, of the richness of its terrestrial landscapes / sailors and especially for its high symbolic and cultural value as a habitat for ancestors and guardian spirits. They organize regular community patrols to preserve territorial integrity and natural resources and issue prescriptions to be observed by members of the community and by visitors. Small subsistence hunting is only practiced in places reserved by the community for this purpose. Careful zoning of the area is carried out on the basis of natural landmarks so that there are integral protection zones, places of worship, places recreation and hiking trails for young people, places for patrols and surveillance operations to protect the area, etc. Law 14/03 currently has 8 categories of Protected Area, but the new "National Strategy for Community Conservation" of the Congolese Congolese Institute for the Conservation of Nature (ICCN) however paves the way for a 9th category Protected Areas established in a participatory manner with communities, recognizing their uses in management plans enforceable against third parties and managed in governance shared with the communities. .

Evidence B: There are 3 examples of IPLC-led conservation projects within the Equator Initiative database.

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: NA/2 *Reviewer B:* 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: There are two relevant World Bank financed projects listed in the EoI. The Co-financing Landscape file lists 11 relevant projects for a total of US\$ 230.2 M including one project of US\$ 6M specifically targeting forest dependent communities support in DRC. The EoI mentions in-kind contributions such as local building materials and human resources, endogenous knowledge. OSAPY is partner in a World Bank financed REDD+ project.

Evidence B: The strongest of these is the REDD+ programs.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 24 in Congo Basin - 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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The long-term objective of the indigenous community living in this area is to preserve the natural and cultural resources for the benefit of future generations.

Evidence B: The objectives are well aligned - to conduct inventories, mapping, zoning and undertake assessments. However, the focus reads more like a strictly conservation project executed by WWF or TNC, rather than a focus on the community.

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: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The project is inclusive of all Pygmy communities and works to get their FPIC. Several activities aim for formal recognition of the conservation management activities which will strengthen their position considerably. The community will be empowered through new structures needed for formal recognition, and enhance its knowledge and skills. The project also contributes to improved sustainable livelihoods and access to health and education.

Evidence B: Missing is a coherent theory of change.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The focus on formal recognition of community-led conservation and community empowerment will strengthen the communities in preventing intruders to enter their area and protecting and revitalizing their natural and cultural habitat, thus also mitigating climate change effects.

Evidence B: It is unclear exactly what the outcomes of this project will be, and how they will tackle major 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: The Eol indicates it is achievable and the activities look relevant and doable within the budget range.

Evidence B: This is highly realistic within the timeframe and budget.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: OSAPY is already a partner in a World Bank financed REDD + project and lists 3 projects financed by World Bank and African Development Bank with significant funding. The EoI also mentions relevant in kind contributions.

Evidence B: Primary sources include existing REDD+ projects and World Bank projects.

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The EoI mentions a total of 280,500 ha under improved management.

Evidence B: 150,000 hectares is the project size.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The project will encourage the inventory of cultural heritage in the area and improve livelihoods of the community as well as access to health care and education.

Evidence B: Additional results are included, but the indicators are unclear and not well aligned.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Effective measures to ensure that community itself perpetuates its activities after the period covered by the funding include community capacity building and income generating activities. Territorial monitoring activities will continue since the communities have always regularly organized community patrols to protect their environment and children. One of the expected result is the authorities' support for the implementation of the project and their involvement in its success.

Evidence B: This section is weak, and does not adequately describe a vision for 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: The DRC strategy for the protection of biodiversity recognizes the participation of IPLCs for the preservation of biodiversity and encourages them to adopt management practices sustainable development of forests to maintain biodiversity. In relation to the determined national contributions (CDN), the project will participate in consolidating the ongoing efforts by the DRC to "achieve a global cap on greenhouse gas emissions". The project activities planned in the area will contribute seriously to the performance of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Program of the province of Mai-Ndombe.

Evidence B: This clearly outlines areas within both documents where the priorities are aligned.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Specific knowledge of women and their role in the communities and the project is clearly expressed and women are involved in all activities. Alternative income activities will be largely managed by women to ensure their social and economic autonomy.

Evidence B: This is a superficial treatment of gender mainstreaming.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The project invests a lot in community building, capacity building, knowledge documentation and sharing and improving advocacy skills.

Evidence B: Although there is a moderate potential to scale up, this is not well articulated in the proposal.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 36/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/40

Average Total Score: 28/40

Performance of Eol 24 in Congo Basin - 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: NA/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: Although answered 'yes' to IPLC prepared in General Information, the information to Question 20 does not make clear if this is an IPLC-led organization as it only mentions it has worked with Pygmy communities. But the organization has one or more projects led by IPLCs from local offices. Through inclusion of FPIC in the project approach and organizational capacity building the project plans to build IPLC capacity over the project term.

Evidence B: It appears to be led by an NGO on behalf of the IPLC group.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The organization has extensive experience, qualifications and demonstrated on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work.

Evidence B: Past leadership evidenced by successful project execution.

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: The EoI lists 4 partner organizations, two of them seem to be IPLC organizations and describes their roles in the project clearly.

Evidence B: Ample evidence of working with a wide range of partners.

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: The EoI lists an impressive list of qualified staff and experience in working with Pygmy people in the DRC. The organization participates in target preparation meetings of GEF small grants in the DRC and benefits from GEF funds through the World Bank and has long standing partnership with World Bank and African Development Bank.

Evidence B: They clearly have capacity, and experience with GEF small grants

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The funding of the organization varies between three and five sources depending on each year and about 10% of in-kind contributions come from the organization, lists three projects over \$200,000 (2 000.000, 00 EUR, 1000.000,00 USD and 1.280.000,00 \$US) and the organization regularly produces reports and financial statements, which it makes available to the board of directors and management, and which are generally complete and delivered to time. External audits are carried out each year and recommendations are implemented.

Evidence B: Very strong experience, including executing large grants of 2 million Euros

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: The organization participates in target preparation meetings of GEF small grants in the DRC and benefits from GEF funds through the World Bank.

Evidence B: Yes, with clear explanation

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 24 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

