

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 242

Organization: Mountain Spirit (MS)

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Helen Tugendhat	242	Himalayas	Nepal	19	32	12	63
Yance Arizona	242	Himalayas	Nepal	21	32	17	70

Performance of Eol 242 in Himalayas - 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:* Key biodiversity areas (two sites included in this EoI)

*Evidence B:* the proposed locations are unique environments with the biological and cultural diversity of indigenous peoples in Himalayan.

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

*Reviewer A: 1/2 Reviewer B: 2/2*

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* The region is one of the biggest deposits of snow and ice outside the polar regions.

### B) Geographical focus in an area under IPLC governance.

3. Is the area held and managed by IPLC under community-based governance systems?

Scoring:

- IPLC governance (rights and institutions) not evident;

- Project areas are marginally under IPLC governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are partially under IPLC systems of governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are largely under IPLC governance, but IPLC rights and/or institutions face significant constraints;
- Project areas are held and managed under IPLC governance systems, with some limitations;
- Project areas are held and managed under strong and active IPLC governance systems

*Reviewer A: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* Local governance is highly informed by government structures (committees, registered user groups, district government, etc.). Indigenous representation in these structures is present. Actual sites are protected areas (National Park and conservation zone) under centralised management, some involvement of communities in the areas, especially buffer zones). The project intends to increase IPLC involvement in conservation activities.

*Evidence B:* The proposed areas are maintained under IPLC governance with significant constrain from the government.

#### 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: 1/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* Traditional ownership patters are well described, but cultural significance is stated, not explained.

*Evidence B:* The applicant stated that the proposed area is culturally significant for IPLCs but it is not clearly explained in the proposal.

#### 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: 3/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Multitude of threats well described - social, developmental, environmental.

*Evidence B:* The proposed area encounters some threats as the impact of tourism projects, unemployment because of Covid-19 impacts, degradation of animistic faith, and conflict in resource governance.

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:* Trend is towards higher recognition of IPLC rights, but not fully realised. In these areas, full realisation is extremely unlikely, but increased control and involvement possible. There is positive government support for such an increase in participation, but not for the underlying rights.

*Evidence B:* The applicant describes some relevant policies such as the constitution, national park regulation, and ratification of ILO Convention by the government.

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:* Policy support exists for increased participation in conservation, although not 'led' by indigenous peoples and communities.

*Evidence B:* The national government recognize the importance of IPLC led-conservation and provide exemptions and privilege on travel and access to resources. Moreover, the government also collaborate with IPLC , especially with rural municipality governments.

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:* Not specific projects, but initiatives related to established protected areas.

*Evidence B:* The applicant has been working with several IPLCs. These activities can be improved through this project. Therefore, the proposed locations are beyond pilot stages.

#### 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:* Strongly aligned but not significant in amounts (or amounts unclear). Sustainable local finance seems likely for a small percentage.

*Evidence B:* There are some projects has been implementing that are related to the goal of this EoI.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 242 in Himalayas - 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:* Capacity building and support is central, however enhanced participation rather than underlying rights is the core aim

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities strongly aligned with the ICI objective to enhance IPLC effort to steward land and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits.

2. Does the EoI present a clear and convincing set of activities and results?

Scoring:

- The objectives and approach for this project lack clarity and cohesion, and/or do not appear to be realistic for the context;
- Activities & results defined but logic (Theory of Change) is incomplete;
- Activities and results are well-defined and cohesive but some aspects require clarification;
- The project has clear objectives and a cohesive approach with relevant activities for the context and timeline

*Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* the EOI explains activities in detail, but it requires some clarification and additional information. Especially on the outcomes of respective activities.

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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Activities link to threats clearly. Political willingness on the side of the government authorities to cede some authority is not addressed.

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities address the threats by focusing on the improvement of IPLC capacity in conservation and natural resource management.

#### 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:* NA

*Evidence B:* The focus of activities in this proposal is to strengthen IPLC capacity in conservation and natural resource management. The applicant is aware of the difficulty to push government to involve in collaborative management with IPLC because the protected area is under the national government instead of local government. The objective to improve IPLC control to land is realistic in this sense.

#### 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:* NA

*Evidence B:* The applicant can mobilize an existing project “Sustaining Snow Leopard Conservation through Strengthening Local Institution and Enterprise Project” to support this Eoi. Estimate budget that can be mobilized is UD 60.000

**B) Potential of the proposed activities to achieve IPLC-led transformational impact that generate global environmental benefits.**

**6. Are the estimated Global Environmental Benefits (GEF core indicators) substantial and realistic?**

*Scoring:*

- Not provided;
- Very Low (below 10,000 Ha);
- Moderate (between 100,000 - 500,000 Ha);
- High (between 500,000 - 1,000,000 Ha);
- Very high above 1,000,000 Ha

*Reviewer A:* 5/5 *Reviewer B:* 5/5

**Average: 5/5**

*Evidence A:* Two sites chosen, combined, are nearly 2 million Ha.

*Evidence B:* the proposed location is very large covering 2,650,00 hectares.

**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:* 3/3

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* NA

**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:* Highly dependent on the reaction and response of local government

*Evidence B:* This project will propagate benefits under the IPLC model of governance through Buffer Zone Users Groups, Conservation Area Committee, and Community Forest Users Groups.

### 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* NA

### 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Both gender relations and caste / socio-economic discrimination is well described and responded to.

*Evidence B:* The implementation of activities will ensure women participation and the Nepal government had issued a policy to include 33% of women in all project activities.

#### 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: 3/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Success in integrating indigenous knowledge and leadership in protected areas - if politically feasible - could be expanded from these two sites outwards to other sites in the same region.

*Evidence B:* Most of the proposed activities focus on the empowerment of IPLC members, such as women and youth. These activities will support the strengthening of IPLC-led conservation in the long run.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 32/40

Performance of Eol 242 in Himalayas - 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: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* Slightly unclear. Applicant is an NGO established by indigenous individuals, unclear how responsive it is to community leadership.

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities are maintained by NGOs and IPLC would be beneficiaries of the activities. However, IPLC will also involve in the implementation of the proposed project.

### 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 3/6**

*Evidence A:* Again slightly unclear, but some evidence of leadership on snow leopard conservation with community participation,

*Evidence B:* The applicant is an NGO consists of many experienced persons working with IPLC and conservation. This information indicates strong leadership for the implementation of big projects related to ICI.

### 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:* Partners not clearly identified as IPLC or not. Local government bodies significant (3 of 4 partners).

*Evidence B:* The applicant will work with local partners, but their role are not clearly described in the EoI.

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: 4/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* The applicant does not have past funded project by GEF, but some senior members have participated in activities funded by GEF.

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:* Low diversity in funding sources, one major previous project only.

*Evidence B:* the average annual budget of the applicant is USD 100.000 to 200.000.

## 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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* Yes but as implementing staff, not managing a project. No reference to safeguards in the answer.

*Evidence B:* senior members have participated in GEF funded projects, and it has access to a Finance Expert who is experienced in GEF fund management.

### Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 12/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30*

**Average Total Score: 14.5/30**

Performance of Eol 242 in Himalayas - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

