

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 141

Organization: 1. My Village (MVi)
2. Indigenous Community-Based Organization Governance Board (ICBO-GC)

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
141	South East Asia (mainland)	Cambodia	18	20	16	54
141	South East Asia (mainland)	Cambodia	20	26	8	54

Performance of Eol 141 in South East Asia (mainland) - 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: As a whole Cambodia is rated low for species rarity and diversity (per data included in survey resources). However, per EoI, areas proposed have numerous endangered and critically endangered species.

Evidence B: NA

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: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Moderate indication of irrecoverable carbon. Illegal logging and other deforestation pressures form increasing population impact area ability to mitigate climate change.

Evidence B: NA

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: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Some communities within the areas have received formal title. Areas are largely under IPLC traditional governance systems, but appear to require significant skill support connect traditional practice to official governing systems.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: Cultural significance is acknowledged and described, but more detail would strengthen impact of project activities to cultural practice.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: Multiple interrelated threats increase overall threat level. Lack of recognition of IPLC rights, illegal logging and over exploitation, overpopulation due to migration, weak government presence and capacity for enforcement of laws are indicated. IPLC land titling and rights is major focus of project.

Evidence B: NA

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: Strategies, acts and laws relating to IPLC land and use rights are described. More detail on the constraints would be useful. Information on IPLC land titling is more detailed. Land laws recognize the right of IPLCs to obtain title to their lands. Process outlined appears extremely burdensome for IPLCs without support. Weak capacity of government to apply and enforce laws and policies is cited as a threat

Evidence B: Limited by land grabbing that takes place

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: See Q.6 above. There is a legal framework for land and use rights, but weak capacity in communities and in government hinders IPLC governance.

Evidence B: Limited by land grabbing that takes place

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Applicant organization has been working with IPLCs (51 communities) for 14 years in the proposed areas on land titling, eco-tourism, NTFPs and other livelihood projects and enforcement.

Evidence B: A few projects listed but not described. More information needs to be given to the projects

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: Applicant organization is in middle of 5 year grant from EU/WWF for \$300kUSD primarily work on ICLP land titling. There are complementary projects indicated on land titling, eco-tourism and livelihood projects. No financial information is included. Projects included align well with project goals but limited information available.

Evidence B: List of projects but no information on whether they are still in implementation.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 141 in South East Asia (mainland) - 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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Approach is well aligned to great enabling conditions for improved GEBs. However GEB are an Outcome dependent on success of governance and livelihood related activities. This is a small area, so alone, global impact is low.

Evidence B: Logical approach to achieving goals

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: Objectives are clear. Activities are very general and require a clear conceptual framework and log frame indicating how objectives are linked and how results will be achieved. Expected results are very ambitious. More work is needed to establish clear scope and purpose of activities.

Evidence B: The activities are strong (Q8) but some issues include: - the need to ensure sustainable practices particularly under Objective 3 - need to increase synergies with government stakeholders could be accomplished under Objective 1 through joint workshops

3. Will the project (objectives and activities) contribute to overcoming identified threats and putting in place necessary enabling opportunities for IPLC-led conservation?

Scoring:

- Objectives and activities do not clearly address identified threats and opportunities;
- Contributions to addressing the threats and opportunities are low;
- Contributions to addressing threats and enabling conditions are slightly over-ambitious;
- The impact on threats and enabling conditions can be realistically accomplished and are sufficiently ambitious for the projects' context

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: See Q. 3 above. Objectives and activities generally address threats and opportunities. However, activity descriptions are vague and overly ambitious. Full proposal would require much more work to establish short and long-term milestones for project and specific implementation plans and requirements for activities.

*Evidence B:*NA

4. Are the activities achievable within a \$500,000 to \$2,000,000 USD budget range in a period of 5 years of project execution?

Scoring:

- Activities/results not aligned with Eol range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: This is a smaller scale project. No indication of overall budget included in Eol.

*Evidence B:*Could be more ambitious for that range of investment

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Only in-kind contributions from communities are included as potential co-financing

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Low. Area under improved management equals 52Kha of which 9Kha are indicated as under improved practice.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Indicators included are primarily livelihood based and not clearly linked to specific project goals.

Evidence B: Need to review the indicators if the proposal is further developed.

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: None of the scoring options is adequate. EoI does address long-term sustainability, but assumptions of how this will be achieved are very general and long term. A more realistic vision for sustainability is needed.

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: Expected contributions of project to Cambodia's NBSAP are clearly laid out in the EoI

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Gender issues are recognized, but described in terms of results, not concrete activities. More details on barriers and opportunities would strengthen a full proposal.

Evidence B: No clear targets set for gender mainstreaming

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:* 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Moderate potential due to vaguely defined and overly ambitious activities.

Evidence B: NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/40

Average Total Score: 23/40

Performance of Eol 141 in South East Asia (mainland) - 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: The EoI indicates that My Village is an IPLC organization. Unable to confirm if this is literally led by indigenous people or has a mission to work on behalf of IPLC. Named partner is also indicated to be an IPLC organization.. Other stated implementing partners appear to be committees and IPLC community groups within communities. IPLC capacity is key objective of the project. Impression from EoI is that this will be a significant task. There is indication of strong dependence on IPLC groups and committees for project action, with need to first build capacity of these groups.

Evidence B: Partnership is stronger than other projects reviewed in that funds are provided to the community groups.

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Applicant organization has 17 years of experience in relevant areas. Another organization is identified as a partner, ICBO-GC founded in 2007, but no further information is provided on experience.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: See A.1 and B.2 above. ICBO is the only other NGO identified as a partner, other entities listed are community committees.

*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: 2/5 Reviewer B: NA/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: No response included in EoI to Part 3. Q. 20 on skills and qualifications of applicant organization or partner. Website shown numerous relevant activities, but reviewer was not able to access information on skills or qualifications.

*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: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Responses indicate capacity, but no supporting information provided. Limited information on sources of finance to support response.

*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: NA/2 Reviewer B: NA/2

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: Topic of safeguards not addressed.

*Evidence B:*NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 8/30

Average Total Score: 12/30

Performance of Eol 141 in South East Asia (mainland) - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

