

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 107

Organization: FORET POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT INTEGRAL

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
107	Congo Basin	DR Congo	21	20	21	62
107	Congo Basin	DR Congo	21	20	18	59

Performance of Eol 107 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Congo Basin, important corridor area connecting 2 NPs, globally important BD

Evidence B: The two provinces (North Kivu and Maniema) where the project will be implemented harbors large extent of forest with many endemic species including some iconic ones such as Grauer's Gorilla and Okapi.

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: Probably high above ground C2 and low below ground C2

Evidence B: The project takes into account the forest corridor linking two national parks (Kahuzi-Biéga and Maiko). A good proportion of the corridor and most of the protected areas are covered with untouched forest.

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Community forest concession Initiatives (CFCLs) seem to be the means for community involvement - only 1 is under Batwa ownership and others belong other local communities; others are supported by local organizations. So not really clear what is IP, what is IPLC etc.

Evidence B: The legislation of the DRC has a provision for the management of natural resources by indigenous people and local communities, but the management responsibility has been effective only in a few sites of the region.

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: Not in detail there is text about general importance of traditional governance etc.

Evidence B: The proponent described precisely the cultural importance of the area for the local communities (bantus) and for the indigenous people (pygmies).

C) Vulnerability of the proposed IPLCs as well as their lands/waters/natural resources to threats.

5. Is the area vulnerable to threats/current risk of negative impacts to IPLC and biodiversity without action?

Scoring:

- No evident threats;
- Low threats;
- Moderate threats;
- Medium-high threats;
- High threats;
- Requires urgent action

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Most of perceived threats relate to community use - agriculture land clearing, wood fuel, NTFPs etc. - and such communities should be part of the solution. but also mining concessions who do not respect environmental standards

Evidence B: The area is highlighted vulnerable to threat coming from logging and mining operation but also from armed conflicts that have been rampant in the region for decades. Local communities and indigenous people's natural resource activities are impacted by these threats.

D) Opportunities for ICI results - including enabling policy conditions, positive government support and presence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up.

6. Are enabling policy conditions in place for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area?

Scoring:

- Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize limited rights for IPLCs over their lands and/or resources;
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: DRC has policy/law with respect to community management - but the key is implementation - especially in context of powerful external interests - mining for example

Evidence B: The legislation of the DRC gives in theory the possibility to the local communities and the indigenous people to manage natural resources. However in practice this is applied in a few areas where projects are implemented.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Gov support in terms of policy/law - while most action on the ground tends to be done by IPLCs supported by small(ish) scale donor funding

Evidence B: The government of the DRC recognizes IPLC-led conservation but is not active promoting it or backing it up.

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: Seems to be a lot of ground work done through other projects - e.g. mapping, BD assessments, education, awareness and such like

Evidence B: There are a few IPLC-led conservation projects that have been implemented or that are under implementation in the proposed area. These projects have been in general successful and have been implemented for most of them by organizations that are partnering with the proponent.

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: NA/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Activities being implemented are important components - but they really need to be brought together under governance so that IPLCs have secure rights and responsibilities to their areas

Evidence B: There are a few initiatives that are complimentary from the proposed projects. These projects are executed by local organizations funded by international entities. Most of these organizations are partnering with the proponent.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 107 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Theory of change weak and focuses too much on activities and not on what the activities will achieve (impact). For example - good governance strengthened is not an outcome, but an activity - so what is the outcome they want. Many of the activities described are “more of the same” and do not really get to the crux of the matter - CLFCs have secure rights and responsibilities for their areas that are respected by all - this requires capacity, management plans (simple participatory), agreed rules and power to sanction and so forth. In short I do not get a strong picture of what the project will really deliver

Evidence B: The proponent has the required experience and is proposing the right approach to engage IPLC in natural resources in the proposed area.

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: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: see comment in 1) above. at this point it is a shopping list of activities - and not really a coherent ToC - which is a pity as some of what might be done could be very important for the longer term governance and management of these CLFCs

Evidence B: The significant proportion of the activities is linked to the consultation of IPLC and fewer to concrete action on the ground.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: At present it is more an Activity Shopping list. This would become much more coherent if framed around a good ToC - this would mean the activities would contribute to bigger impacts and objectives

Evidence B: The proposed activities may lead to an improvement of the situation in minimizing locally the threats affecting the biodiversity of the region. However the transfer of the responsibility of the management of the resources to IPLC needs to be officialized by the administration to allow long term development goals such as the one linked to the promotion of cocoa.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Again the challenge of linking activities to outcomes - what does this project really want to achieve in the big picture - XX CFCLs with community owned management plans and strong governance structures so they have secure rights and responsibilities to manage their lands (or something like that)

Evidence B: The activities proposed are achievable in the time frame and the budget proposed. The proponent and its partners have a track record of achieving the objectives assigned in context of projects.

5. Does the Eol 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: A good diversity of donors on a range of activity areas. Does not state indicative amounts of funding. One project is involved with simple CFCL management plans

Evidence B: There are a number of initiatives that can be considered as co-financing that re funded by international organizations and implemented by local NGOs of which a number of them are partners of the proponent.

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: Considering this is an important corridor area - I would really expect outcomes and activities that contribute to the corridor integrity - a series of connected CFCLs, management structures in place and strong, restoration measures (FLR, AF), livelihood improvement in place

Evidence B: About 120,000 ha of forest are considered in the proposal and an additional 1,000 ha land dedicated to agroforestry.

7. Are the additional cultural and livelihoods results contributing to project objectives?

Scoring:

- No provided cultural or livelihood indicators for the project;
- Indicators proposed but are not clearly aligned with project goals;
- Indicators proposed and are moderately aligned with project goals;
- Additional cultural and/or livelihood indicators clearly derive from project goals

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: But missing indicator of (something like) XX Functioning CFCLs as part of corridor connectivity with strong management institutions

Evidence B: Additional indicators could have been identified to measure results of culture objectives of the project.

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:* 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: will be embedded in large CLFC program being carried out by consortium members

Evidence B: The long-term impact is not clearly presented. It is probably the result of the uncertainty regarding the support that the proponent must receive from the government in term of transfer of management responsibility.

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Mainly through SDGs (esp poverty reduction) and Ministerial order for their 5 year plan of action

Evidence B: The project is pretty well aligned with the NBSAP.

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: NA

Evidence B: There is a mention of the promotion of women as part of the activities proposed but there is no details on how this will be implemented and the objective is not quantified.

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Not clear how it links to what others are doing and how this will improve conservation and livelihood security of the whole and important corridor areas

Evidence B: The approach proposed by the project could certainly be transposed to other parts of the DRC. Avoiding forest fragmentation in maintaining or restoring forest corridors between protected areas is an important forest management approach.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/40

Average Total Score: 20/40

Performance of Eol 107 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Its not clear, looks as though NGOs support IPLC works and this might result in longer term funding for CFLCs

Evidence B: The project is led by NGOs with the participation of IPLC and for their benefit.

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: Consortium well established in area for longish period of time, and seems to have a demonstrated track record

Evidence B: The main proponent has demonstrated on-ground leadership and some of the partners of the proponent have an ever greater field experience working with IPLC.

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Role in implementation - but not clear what role. Roles should be clear and spelt out (as they don't duplicate)

Evidence B: The proponent has established a good consortium with other NGOs involved in the region and experience with IPLC organizations.

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: No GEF exp. but has exp with other large-ish projects

Evidence B: In the field of consultation and mapping the proponent seems to have the technical capacity. In the field of agroforestry (cocoa production) it is less obvious. The proponent mentions internal capacity in agroforestry but the level of capacity is not defined clearly.

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: Not sure on financial reporting (no box ticked) or on funding source diversity (no box ticked), though the consortium has diversified funding streams

Evidence B: The proponent and its partners have a moderate capacity to manage projects technically and financially.

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: Seems to have exp with Wb safeguard (as well as NORAD, USAID)

Evidence B: The proponent and its partners have a significant experience managing funds from large aid agencies which implies that they have experience with safeguards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 19.5/30

Performance of Eol 107 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

