

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 200

Organization: Eco Custodian Advocates

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Sam Johnston	200	Melanesia	Papua New Guinea	14	12	23	49
Charles Burg	200	Melanesia	Papua New Guinea	26	31	24	81

Performance of Eol 200 in Melanesia - 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: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Normanby Island, Milne Bay Province, PNG, where the proposed project is situated, has high levels of terrestrial vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant endemism. The Bwebweso site also harbors a unique plant community due to the underlying ultramafic bedrock on which it is located. If extended to further into the East Papuan Islands, the project would include many other sites of high endemism and 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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Indeed, the online scoring tool map depicts a rate > 150 t/ha, which shows that the area is highly important for climate mitigation.

Evidence B: PNG, as one of the three remaining recognized global tropical wilderness areas, is an important player in climate mitigation. The forest on Bwebweso is largely intact at this point, but under threat from mining exploration.

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: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: PNG law, both its constitution and legislation, recognizes local land and resource tenure and gives management rights to local clans and communities. However, while surface resources are held under traditional tenure systems, underground minerals remain the property of the national government. However, local landowners would have a significant say in any prospective development of a mine in the area.

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: The EoI clearly explains the importance of the BWEBWESO area as it is essential to the protection of the local cultural heritage environment (archaeological and oral tradition) as well as biodiversity and wildlife.

Evidence B: The Bwebweso site is considered sacred by surrounding clans and communities as the place where the spirits of their dead go to rest. As such, its destruction would have both cultural and biodiversity implications.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: In accordance with the data available on the CI database, it will rank the project as a Medium-high threat. Currently, there are development pressures that compromise the region. This also includes logging, subsistence gardening extension, and road development, among others.

Evidence B: Proposed prospecting for nickel ore and any possible mining activity would be extremely detrimental to the landscape and its biodiversity and to the surrounding waterways and marine habitats, which would be impacted by siltation from mining activities.

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: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There are still several challenges and conflicts between customary law and statutory law as well as which law would govern the relations between IPCLs and colonisers in respect to the land and its resources.

Evidence B: Legal frameworks exist that support the preservation of cultural and sacred sites in PNG, but the regulatory structures that enable such legislation to be easily administered appear to be somewhat lacking, hence this project's proposal to test means of enabling communities to more easily register their sacred sites.

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: There is legal recognition of the importance of the area and the communities living there. However, there is no provided evidence of active government support and engagement in the promotion of IPLC-led conservation initiatives.

Evidence B: The ECA has a current MOU with the Milne Bay Province government and works closely with affected communities.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: There is a lengthy history of IPLC-led conservation projects in Papua New Guinea and Milne Bay Province. However, this project with its focus on securing protection for sacred sites as a means of conservation appears to be new.

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: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: As noted in D above, this project appears to be unique. However, the existing conservation work with IPLC communities by ECA should complement this proposal.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 200 in Melanesia - 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 project will carry a valuable cultural heritage outcome that would enable and contribute to improvements in sustainable management and conservation of the islands' environments.

Evidence B: The project's aim to strengthen IPLC communities' ability to secure formal protection for sacred sites and thereby conserve the biodiversity resources on those sites seems very well aligned with ICI objectives. In particular, the project seeks to prove the efficacy its proposed methodology as a precursor to expanding its use across PNG.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The activities described to collect and register information on sacred sites in the East Papuan Islands are well defined, but a more detailed timeline would be helpful. It is assumed that the described activities are ongoing and overlapping in the various communities in the region, but it would be wise to begin in one locale, see what works/what doesn't work, then expand into adjoining areas and communities. This is probably what is planned, but it needs to be better described.

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*As described, the activities under this proposal would appear to provide local communities with the means to register their sacred sites with the government in a way that has a long-term impact on their preservation. By providing a means to record (both verbally and in writing) and preserve the stories and significance of sacred sites, the project enhances the ability of those communities to forestall future threats to those sites integrity, including from internal disputes over their cultural relevance.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*The amount of investment required depends on the scope of the project. If it expands significantly into the islands beyond Normanby, as proposed, the budget is well aligned.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The EOI describes in-kind support from both participating communities and the Milne Bay Provincial Government. Moderate funding is also available from a US-based foundation.

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The project projects impacts on 50,000 ha, particularly if expanded beyond the Bwebweso site on Normanby into adjoining East Papuan Islands.

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: NA

Evidence B: The indicators primarily focus on successful completion of the activities, but it would be ideal if they also focused on any measurable increase in site preservation resulting from the activities to record and register information on sacred sites.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The project makes a convincing argument that sacred site preservation/conservation can be secured and over the long-term through the recording of oral histories around sacred sites and preservation of those histories for future generations that might otherwise have lost the reasons for saving such culturally relevant sites. Once established, the method by which these histories are preserved should gain a footing beyond the scope of this project.

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: PNG has not yet revised its NBSAP in accordance with the Aichi Targets. However, in lieu of a revised PNG NBSAP, this project does align with several of the Aichi Targets.

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Even though the project emphasises inclusivity by opening up participation for women, through the sections there is no clear information regarding culture difference, gender barriers, and how the project will address these issues when working with communities to preserve cultural heritage. There is a lack of information development.

Evidence B: Many of the Milne Bay cultures are matrilineal and women have a stake thereby in resource decisions on ancestral lands. The project also is structured to ensure that women partake in the preservation of cultural knowledge; that their own histories and stories are preserved alongside those of the men in their communities. The description of how these stories are gathered and preserved is both culturally sensitive and well thought out.

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: NA

Evidence B: If successful, the project has a very high potential for impacting the preservation of sacred sites well beyond the confines of Milne Bay Province. PNG has thousands of such sites across the country, and if this model of capturing and preserving oral histories works in Milne Bay, it should be transferrable to other parts of the country, as well.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 12/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 31/40

Average Total Score: 21.5/40

Performance of Eol 200 in Melanesia - 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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: While this project has relevant support from both the Milne Bay Government and local communities, ECA is not specifically an IPLC organization. It is led by David Mitchell, who has PNG citizenship and has lived in Milne Bay for decades, but he is not native. Other staff members are from Milne Bay. However, while ECA provides the “spark” and the technical means for this project, for it to be successful, local communities must have complete buy-in and take the lead on its implementation. As described, that is what the project proposes to do.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: ECA has a long history of working with communities in Milne Bay Province on a variety of conservation-related issues and challenges. It has staff from Milne Bay, support from the Milne Bay Government, and local communities, all of whom are long-term collaborators on its work.

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: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*As noted in B above, ECA has a long history of working with local communities in Milne Bay Province on conservation issues. No progress can be made on conservation without the full embrace of local communities/clans, as they hold tenure rights to all resources on their traditional lands and make all decisions about resource management. Without strong partnerships with IPLCs, ECA could not operate successfully in Milne Bay or anywhere else in PNG.

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: NA

*Evidence B:*ECA has implemented GEF projects in the past and has demonstrated skill sets necessary to implement the proposed course of work in this EOI.

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: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: ECA has a moderately diversified funding stream. However, it has no current projects over \$200K, and it only conducts financial audits upon request from its funders. I believe that the organization would require some enhanced project management capacity, particularly in financial management, in order to fully meet GEF reporting and management requirements. However, it should be possible to address that through the 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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The organization has extensive experience with implementing GEF projects.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 23.5/30

Performance of Eol 200 in Melanesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

