

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 192

Organization: CIS TIMOR VOLLUNTERS ASSOCIATION

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Yance Arizona	192	South East Asia (Islands)	Indonesia	20	17	11	48
Jennifer Rubis	192	South East Asia (Islands)	Indonesia	25	29	12	66

Performance of Eol 192 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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The proposed location is a marine area in the eastern part of Indonesia that is maintained by indigenous communities. The proposed area is one of the key biodiversity areas in the region with many marine potential.

Evidence B: The EOI for Rote Ndao and Sabu Island provides for conservation in a small island-coastal-sea landscape that is considered an area of high biodiversity.

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

- >50 t/ha - Low;
- 50 - 100 t/ha - Moderate;
- >100 t/ha - High

Reviewer A: NA/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The applicant does not describe potential carbon stock in the proposed area. The geospatial data indicates that the proposed location is covered with low carbon density

Evidence B: While the question and spatial resource guide presumably point towards terrestrial carbon, there is an unknown element due to the presence of blue carbon or carbon stored in marine environments. Therefore the score is not low (as it should be for the comparatively small footprint), but moderate.

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 proposed area is managed under strong IPLC governance system and the traditional coastal management is recognized by regulation in Indonesia.

Evidence B: The proposal provides adequate justification to demonstrate the continuing active role of IPLC customary natural resource management.

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: The applicant states the importance of the proposed area to local community and their culture, but this aspect is not clearly described in the EoI.

Evidence B: The cultural significance of the site is clearly demonstrated by the complex traditional management system outlined.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The main threat to the proposed location is environmental pollution and unsustainable natural resource management practices. Geospatial data indicated that the proposed location faces high development pressure, but it is not threatened by other big threats. The marine threat and context is 65 below the global average.

Evidence B: There are several external threats listed in the EOI, these include sand mining and coral extraction activities, fishing activities using fish bombs, potassium, tubal dangke, trawl trawlers, mangrove logging activities etc. The EOI also lists large-scale agricultural land clearing, land shifting practices, deforestation, increased use of pesticides in agriculture, exploitation and excavation land, clearing of agricultural land into settlements etc. It is intimated, though not clearly stated that some of these relate to large scale commercial activities, and some to community level/small business/individual commercial activities. What will be needed in a future stage is to be able to clearly differentiate the types/source of the threats, as well as specific activities to address the threats in order to increase effectiveness and sustainability.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The national legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance in coastal areas.

Evidence B: The EOI quotes regulatory frameworks to support the project. The question of reconciling and promoting coherence between different government frameworks for the commercial extraction activities (sand mining, coral mining, trawler fishing, land clearing etc, see question 5 - unless these are illegal), may need to be addressed in future iterations of the proposal

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 local government has implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation. For instance, SPARC project.

Evidence B: The EOI provides examples of both local and federal/central government interaction in these types of projects.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The applicant has been working with some communities to establish a pilot project for IPLC-led conservation. Therefore, the proposed project will be to strengthen an existing program.

Evidence B: Particularly through the traditional customary governance systems highlighted.

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: The applicant is working with another project that is relevant to provide complementary support for IPLC-led conservation in the region.

Evidence B: The project highlights two relevant activities, the first of higher alignment than the other. That said, the linkage to a local government initiative is important to demonstrate the potential for country support. There are several activities listed in the question on references that demonstrate an ongoing complementarity - in relation to this it would be important to note in future iterations how a proposal would build on those initiatives rather than just replicate them.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 192 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposed project is well aligned with the overall objective of ICI to enhance IPLCs effort to steward natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits.

Evidence B: Provides clear, community centered orientation, focusing on empowering the community through their strength (i.e. their knowledge system and culture).

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The proposed activities are listed in the EoI, but they require to describe as a systematic activity to achieve innovative change. It seems that activities only listed without clear theory of change.

Evidence B: Clear activities and roadmap to achieving the results. The project would need to ensure it builds on previous work through an analysis of what was accomplished before, lessons learned and gaps that will be filled.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Some activities are designed to tackle threats to IPLC-led conservation.

*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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposed activities are well aligned with Eol range of investment.

*Evidence B:*With the budget range, there could be more ambition to also address what could be external threats such as existing extraction activities. This would incentivize and support the communities to utilize their customary management systems.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The applicant expects to have co-financing from two ongoing programs and share budget from the district and village governments.

Evidence B: The EOI refers to the value of the community traditions as a source of co finance, as well as government initiatives. The first is of course invaluable and the second politically important.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: The proposed area of intervention by this project is 455 hectares.

Evidence B: The numbers provided in the EOI might be a severe under estimation as the potential area of influence around the Sawu National Park would put it in the Moderate category.

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: NA/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The applicant does not clearly describe relevant cultural and livelihood indicators from the proposed project.

Evidence B: If there is a further development of the EOI, the organization could be encouraged to develop cultural indicators around strengthened knowledge systems, and number of artisanal fishers (women and men) improving sustainability of their 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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The applicant indicated that the proposed project will build a strong natural resource management system, but it will require another support especially from the government to make them sustainable.

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: NA/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The applicant does not clearly describe the connection of the proposed project with national priorities as defined in NBSAPS and NDCs.

Evidence B: National priorities of NBSAP not outlined. This section will require more reflection in any future iteration.

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: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The applicant describes the significant role of women in the family economy, but it is not clear how is the role of women in the implementation of the proposed activities.

Evidence B: Many fishing societies would have differentiated roles for women, indeed in seaweed processing as outlined in the EOI, but there needs to be further reflection on the other types of activities women may be involved in. The following resource <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4884e.pdf> (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4884e.pdf>) might help expand understanding how to mainstream gender in artisanal fisheries.

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: The proposed project location is too small and specific to demonstrate the innovative potential for the transformative results.

Evidence B: Needs to be coupled with outreach and exchanges with other communities


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 17/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 23/40

Performance of Eol 192 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: NA/6

Average: NaN/6

Evidence A: The applicant is a local NGO that has a strong connection to grassroots communities. The project is intended to provide benefits for IPLCs, but it is not quite clearly described the role of local communities in the implementation of the proposed activities.

*Evidence B:*Unclear whether the Organization is IP driven.

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: The applicant demonstrates good networking with local NGOs and communities.

*Evidence B:*Has provided project and financing previous to this.

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: IPLCs is not clearly defined in the proposed project. This condition might be because the applicant is a local NGO that has a strong background and relationship with local communities.

Evidence B: The communities traditional institutions are listed however what is unclear is their role as 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The applicant has capacity to execute the project at the local level, but assistance will require in the implementation of the project.

Evidence B: The organization has shown experience with similar projects listed however does not identify specific skill sets in relation to working with communities' knowledge.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: The annual budget of the applicant is 6-7 billion IDR equal to USD 414.578. This amount is quite big for a local NGO. However, this is not fully reflected in the EoI about the main source of the organisational budget.

Evidence B: Capacity for external audits not demonstrated.

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: 11/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 12/30

Average Total Score: 11.5/30

Performance of Eol 192 in South East Asia (Islands) - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

