

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 248

Organization: Snow Leopard Conservancy India Trust

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Helen Tugendhat	248	Himalayas	India	20	28	19	67
Yance Arizona	248	Himalayas		17	18	17	52

Performance of Eol 248 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: High significance of fauna and birdlife, but small area. KBA.

Evidence B: The proposed location is the northeast part of India where found diversity flora and fauna. However, according to spatial resources, the proposed location is not much covered with KBA and intact forest landscape.

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: Low carbon stocks.

Evidence B: The proposal does not mention potential carbon stock in the proposed location. However, the geospatial data indicated that the proposed location in moderate carbon density.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Highly militarised area, but strong local governance described. Central government appears to respect and work with local governance structures.

Evidence B: The proposed location is not included as recognized IPLC lands. The proposal indicated that the location is partly under the control of IPLC, but the location is contested with government agencies.

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The applicant stated that the location is culturally significant for the IPLC, but it is not well described in the EoI.

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: Population pressures, development pressures, recent change in status of the area opens up more possibility of exploitation

Evidence B: The Ladakh community has recorded as the world's first climate refugees, where lack of water has forced rural communities to relocate. Leopard population is under serious threat due to retaliatory killing of leopards.

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: Some strong laws described. Implementation challenging.

Evidence B: The India government recognize the importance of IPLC governance, but it is a lack in the implementation.

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: Local initiatives for snow leopard conservation have found support from the government and expanded.

Evidence B: The government has enacted some regulation for promoting IPLC

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: Area covered by the proposal is small, but evidence of projects implemented by village members is clear.

Evidence B: The applicant has been involved in several projects to improve IPLC governance. For instance through livestock insurance, local handicraft. Moreover, the Ladakh obtained award from UNESCO for Himalayan Homestay Programs

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: 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: UNDP and other major donors interested in 'securing the Himalayas' - major focus of all described projects is on snow leopard conservation.

Evidence B: The applicant currently involves in some projects that relevant with the proposed activities in the EoI. This program can provide additional output for the existing programs.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 18.5/30

Performance of Eol 248 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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Extremely well aligned except the 'global environmental benefits', it is unclear whether improved snow leopard conservation is sufficient to be a global benefit.

Evidence B: The proposed activities are well aligned with the objective of ICI 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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The core activity in the proposal is ecotourism. The applicant describes some activities, but these activities were not complete with expected outcomes.

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: Political threats clear but difficult to address. other threats addressed directly.

Evidence B: The proposed activities are not strictly linked with the attempts to tackle the threats. For instance to understand the relationship between developing ecotourism with preventing climate refugees or preventing the killing of leopards.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: At the smaller end (100k a year)

Evidence B: The proposed activities are partly aligned with Eol range of investment

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: A number of projects mentioned, and sources described, but no amounts provided.

Evidence B: The applicant stated some relevant activities to support the program, but it does not clearly describe potential mobilization of co-financing to support the implementation of this project.

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: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The claimed area is much higher, but can't see the rationale for that scale of change.

Evidence B: the proposed area is too large covering 6.24 million hectares with estimated direct benefits for 50.000 people.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: livelihood and cultural revival indicators clear.

Evidence B: The applicant described an activity involving traditional governance and customary revitalization that is relevant with the objective of this 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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*The project does not seem to have clear long-term impact, but the applicant stated local, national, and international networks will continue to support the IPLC-led conservation. .

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Not clear how strong this link is, very little description of national priorities.

*Evidence B:*The proposed project is weakly related to either national priorities, but the applicant mentioned that the government enacted the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan that require dissemination to the IPLC members.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Strong community level work is evident by the proposing organisation, with strong involvement by women, plus a women-led partner organisation as well.

*Evidence B:*Women's participation is moderately through some activities, mainly in maintaining homestays.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Local focus of the project is clear, but replicability across the ranges of the snow leopard would be logical and is claimed as a potential long-term expansion,.

Evidence B: The central activity in the proposed project is ecotourism that is seen not to much provide impact to the objective of ICI. Therefore, it would be a lack of potential for transformative result scale while the proposed are for the project is too large.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/40

Average Total Score: 23/40

Performance of Eol 248 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: NGO advisory to the project, fiduciary role also NGO, application appears written by IPLC representatives.

Evidence B: The proposal is a combination of IPLC organizations and NGOs. The applicant is a community-based organization consists of indigenous groups. The applicant will work with other NGOs and IPLC groups to implement the proposed activities.

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: NA

Evidence B: The applicant demonstrated on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed works.

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: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The implementation of the proposed activities mostly with other partners NGOs by targeting IPLC member as beneficiaries of the project.

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: Project is proposed by a small organisation - this would be a step up for them. No experience with GEF.

Evidence B: The applicant has adequate skills and capacity for the project but does not have experience with GEF projects

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: Diverse funding, annual audits, but small - no projects over 200k, and annual budget currently 100k

Evidence B: The average budget of the applicant is USD 100.000, but the applicant has experience working with more than 5 funding agencies.

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: Explained capacity assessment, but not safeguards.

Evidence B: The applicant operation and financial management system were assessed by other reputable institutions (UNDP). But the applicant does not have experience with GEF standards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 18/30

Performance of Eol 248 in Himalayas - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

