

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 144

Organization: Tree Kangaroo Conservation Program

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
144	Melanesia/ Polynesia	Papua New Guinea	29	35	29	93
144	Melanesia/ Polynesia	Papua New Guinea	24	34	26	84

Performance of Eol 144 in Melanesia/Polynesia - 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* PNG is a mega diverse country with an estimated 70% of its rainforest habitat remaining intact. It has exceptional species richness and endemism. Importantly the submission notes that currently there are no roads entering the project area.

*Evidence B:* The proposed landscape is a highly significant area for biodiversity globally. Information from the EoI and the online scoring tool describes the Yopno-Uruwa-Som (YUS) landscape in PNG's Huon Peninsula as an expansion of over 160,000 hectares of land. This protected area covers approximately 750 km<sup>2</sup> of forest range. Biologically, it harbours c. 14,000 native plant species and 9000 endemic species, making it the only island group in Malaysia with more endemic than non-endemic plant species. Furthermore, PNG is home to approximately 20,000 plant species, more than 700 bird species and more than 230 mammal species, many of which are only found in New Guinea Island. Local and International conservation analyses identify this area as a priority for conservation.

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:* Tropical rainforests are well-established high-value carbon stores, and these habitats occupy 70% of the project area.

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

## 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* This is well described in the submission, referencing the PNG Constitution and the Organic Law on Provincial and Local-level governments 1998, as well as the communal nature of land ownership and decision-making, and the diversity of cultural and livelihood dependencies of the local populations on the landscape and its resources.

*Evidence B:* No data available in CI database. The EoI put emphasis on the importance of good governance and resource management and highlights the decision-making representation and active participation of YUS landowners in the area. However, considering external sources of information, PNG faces a number of challenges including poor law and order and complex governance arrangements that are worth taking into account for the purpose of the project, which are not referred to in the EoI.

### 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:* see above

*Evidence B:* The EoI clearly explains the importance of the YUS conservation area as it essential to the protection of biodiversity and wildlife, and preserve local cultural heritage. The EoI illustrates the importance of the YUS forests, seascapes and wildlife as well as its direct cultural connection to IPLCs. Additional data regarding culture diversity, social and cultural resources in the area would be useful.

## 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* While the relative remoteness of the site presents a degree of insulation from the major development pressures affecting many parts of PNG, the pressures at YUS are more localised and relate to local unsustainable hunting, fishing and agricultural practices, and therefore mostly related to local population growth. Climate change is a major concern, as is national development pressures for more infrastructure such as roads, and activities such as commercial logging, clearing for plantations, and broad scale agricultural practices, threatening the subsistence economies of the project area.

*Evidence B:* Social and environmental issues are attributable to mining, oil and gas exploitation, and logging in the YUS area. The exploration of oil and gas carries significant amounts of infrastructure, with pipelines and shipping routes stretching thousands of kilometres. Furthermore, marine, freshwater and forest habitats are potentially threatened by land clearance, pollution, oil spills and waste, which in turn threatens the globally significant species and unique cultures that rely on those habitats.

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:* There are sound legal and policy frameworks in the country, although PNG has a poor record in controlling corruption and illegal activities that target natural resources. Compliance with existing laws and policies is therefore a risk. Having said this the existing governance arrangements for YUS are solidly based in communal and representative decision-making and provide an existing foundation for IPLC conservation

*Evidence B:* PNG's national strategies protect and focus on natural resources and the environment. The 2050 PNG vision map fosters nature protection and reinforces roles of economic growth, human development and environmental management.

## 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The constitution, and the policy and legal framework promotes IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation. The risk is that these are insufficient unless there is oversight, compliance and enforcement of these policies and laws.

*Evidence B:* 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.

## 8. Are there successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives in the proposed area that provide a foundation for scaling up?

Scoring:

- No IPLC-led conservation initiatives have been implemented;
- Few IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented in pilot stages only;
- Some IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented beyond pilot stages;
- Relevant IPLC-led conservation projects have been well established for many years

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

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The Tree Kangaroo Conservation Program commenced in 1996, the YUS Conservation was formed in 2005, and in 2009 the YUS Conservation Area was declared under the Conservation Areas Act, and its is managed by local communities who own and control the land. All these initiatives, history and governance arrangements provide a sound basis for the proposed work.

*Evidence B:* Conservation initiatives are supported by local government and international organisations in order to protect and preserve the area. For example, the five-year USAID Biodiversity Project in PNG, TKCP and BIOPAMA provides strategic guidance and training for the YUS landscape conservation.

## 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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* There are four complementary and supporting projects (with district and international support)

*Evidence B:* Several projects are mentioned but no actual investment information about them is available.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 26.5/30

Performance of Eol 144 in Melanesia/Polynesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 1)



## Section 2 - Quality and ability of the proposed approach and interventions to achieve transformational impact that generate the global environmental benefits (Total Points: 40)

### A) Quality of proposed approach and ability to support traditional structures, knowledge and community practices in the delivery of global environmental benefits.

1. Is the proposed approach well aligned with the overall objective of the ICI to: Enhance Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' (IPLCs) efforts to steward land, waters and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits?

Scoring:

- Weakly aligned;
- Partially aligned;
- Well aligned;
- Exceptionally well aligned

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

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The submission clearly identifies the current arrangements for local community-led stewardship (arising from a long history, and current policy, legal and administrative frameworks). The core governance and management structure - the YUS Conservation Organisation - blends local community leadership with each level of government also represented. The focus of the work - to achieve healthy ecosystems that support their local communities - has global benefits from the retention and health of the biodiverse and carbon rich habitats

*Evidence B:* Under PNG's customary land tenure system, the management of the YUS Conservation Area relies on the active participation of multiple stakeholders including Government (National, Provincial, District and Local-Level), Non-Governmental Organisations, and, most importantly, the Customary YUS Landowners and other community representatives. This project will focus on essential pillars that align with the objective of the ICI. It will foster organisational development, leadership empowerment and protected area governance capacity-building for the YUS Conservation Organisation as well as implementing sustainability and natural resource management programs.

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

Scoring:

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

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

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* The proposal presents a clear and cohesive set of activities that build on a successful decade of conservation activity and achievements, focusing on future leadership and building local management capacity, monitoring and reporting, community engagement and planning, and sustainable financing.



*Evidence B:* The project sets specific and clear outcomes; however, it is important to specify some of the boundaries among projects and funding already involved for the protection and management of the area. Certainly, this involves activities that are part of other projects, and this mixture may cause project deviations, which might draw focus away from the IPCL organisation leadership development.

### 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Given the work and achievements to date, the project's aims and activities are realistic and achievable. The primary purpose is to strengthen local leadership and capacity - that will enable the (primary) local threats (of localised unsustainable harvesting and practices) to be managed effectively, while building resilience and resistance to the wider threats that are likely to emerge from national development pressures.

*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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* NA

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* There is a current USA project running to 2024

*Evidence B:*NA

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:* A total area of 162683 hectares is identified under the category

*Evidence B:*NA

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

*Scoring:*

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

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

**Average: 3/3**

*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: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

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

**Average: 3/3**

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* It is also important to highlight gender inclusion not only in the programs lead by the organisations but also in the management and structure of the TKCP and the YUS Conservation Organisation.

#### 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* A key element is the sharing of lessons and the replication of the YUS model elsewhere in PNG and beyond. The project won an Equator Prize for its innovation and leadership.

*Evidence B: NA*


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 35/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 34/40

Average Total Score: 34.5/40

Performance of Eol 144 in Melanesia/Polynesia - 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:NA*

### 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:NA*

### 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:NA*

#### 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:NA*

#### E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the EoI demonstrate project & financial management capacity needed for scale of proposed effort?

*Scoring:*

- Very limited (no criteria met);
- Some capacity but would require support (1/3 criteria);
- Moderate capacity (2/3 criteria met);

- Very strong (all criteria met) with demonstrated past performance

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

**Average: 6/6**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:NA*

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: YEs with GEF6 and UNDP*

*Evidence B:NA*



Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 27.5/30

Performance of Eol 144 in Melanesia/Polynesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

