

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 301

Organization: CENTRE DE RECHERCHE SUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT, LA DEMOCRATIE ET LES DROITS DE L'HOMME, (CREDDHO /asbl)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Olivier Langrand	301	Congo Basin	DR Congo	27	31	20	78
Edmund Barrow	301	Congo Basin	DR Congo	22	26	18	66

Performance of Eol 301 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: The region under consideration by this project is very important on a biodiversity point of view. It includes many different types of natural habitats, forests, wetlands, savannah... The Virunga is an iconic protected and the area has a large number of endemic species of plants and animals.

Evidence B: Virunga home to Mt Gorilla, and whole area part Albertine rift and into Congo Basin. Huge pressures - human use, long standing violence. Also is important part of shared ecosystem between Rw, Ug and DRC

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: The area that includes the Virunga is sequestering large amounts of carbon and the proposed activities have the potential to increase the existing carbon sequestration capacity of the area.

Evidence B: Though I would assume mostly above ground C2, little below ground

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The area is well advanced in terms of the management by IPLC with the support of the provincial authorities and of the ICCN. The management includes forest and wetlands alike.

Evidence B: Parks under National gov. Most lands under de facto community and IPLC. Increased recognition of IPLC (Batwa) rights and responsibilities - they have at least 1 forest concession for sustainable management by Batwa for their benefit - not commercial. Important to learn from

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: The proposal describes the cultural significance of the area for both the local communities and the indigenous people living there. It is illustrated by two examples.

Evidence B: Importance of Batwa de facto traditionally managed landscapes both around Virunga but also up to Ruwenzori. But also important basis for really respecting IPLC conditions of Batwa and the pressures they are all under

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: The poor management of the natural resources is the main threat affecting biodiversity. This is the result of poor governance, corruption, poverty and the increasing population. There is also the risk associated with recent oil exploration in the area.

Evidence B: mainly de facto traditional management only partially supported by weak state authority (violence). this combined with local people and Batwa not really involved in decision making or planning. this exacerbates existing pressure - degradation, timber, degradation, militarization of the PAs, no governance, - some of this could be resolved through this project - but I doubt if it will have much effect on military

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There are a number of conservation activities that are IPLC led in the area. IPLC have also an established collaboration with the provincial administration and with ICCN for the co-management of natural resources in different projects taking place in the area under consideration by the project.

Evidence B: National level political support, some existing funding for this sort of IPLC approach - that is why it is important for this project to really try and make a difference in a defined geography and not spread itself too thin

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: IPLC groups involved in the area proposed for the project are already receiving an active support from the provincial administration and have an agreement with ICCN for the co-management of resources in the context of the Virunga National Park.

Evidence B: As it is DRC difficult to really say - there is Gov commitment to sustainable NRM and exploitation. there are some smallish projects on the ground - implemented by NGOs and IP orgs

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:* 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: This project will build on a strong foundation of IPLC-led initiatives in the context of natural resource management. The model has the potential for replication elsewhere in the province of North Kivu or in other parts of Eastern DRC or even Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi.

Evidence B: there are some projects implemented by partners of this EoI - but it seems to be spread very thinly. Hence for this EoI focus focus - what will the outcomes be, what is the geography

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 is a handful of IPLC-led initiatives in the area considered by the project that will complement the proposed project.

Evidence B: Implemented by partners of this EoI and are generally small scale in nature. challenge will be to bring these separate sets of activities together in a coherent governance strategy in a reasonably defined geography


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 24.5/30

Performance of Eol 301 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposed project is based on the support to IPLC-led actions in the field of the sustainable management of natural resources both in forest and freshwater ecosystems.

Evidence B: But there is not an idea of what the outcomes will be - except in the context of specific results. I see an outcome that is something like "The governance and management of XX ICCA areas in {clear defined geographic landscape - perhaps around Virunga or Lake Edward or Ruenzoris - but not that huge area which is very insecure} secured under ICCA management" - or something like that - and then all the activities flow from there

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: The proposed activities and the expected results are mostly about consultation and planning . It would be good to see more concrete activities devoted to the sustainable management of natural resources. The project proposed to address the important and sensitive issue of the increasing population in the area through family planning.

Evidence B: No clear outcome(s) - but good set of activities which need to be pulled together in a coherent ToC. So this needs some work on

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposed project is likely to address the main threats to biodiversity identified through IPLC-led activities.

Evidence B: Over ambitious and lack focus. If they have a strong outcome and deliver the work in a defined geography as suggested will be much stronger

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: The proponent has the needed experience for implementing this project.

Evidence B: Problem - it is a set of activities with a set of indicators - which do not tell a coherent story in terms of what will be achieved. Yes capacity is important, as are income activities, as is knowledge - but what is all this for

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proponent mentions many different projects in detail that should constitute concrete source of co-financing but did not indicate the amount invested in these different projects.

Evidence B: And /varied from small NGO projects to larger WB type investments. the challenge will be to bring this together in synergy and make a strong implementation outcome for a defined area

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: This is well documented and includes benefits for forest and fresh-water ecosystems.

Evidence B: BUT - I think this project is aiming too high over too large an area that is very complex in terms of conservation, peoples, military, security etc. It would be a strong project if it could focus on one area (one of Virunga, Edward, Ruenzori)

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: The information provided demonstrates that there are additional cultural and livelihoods results.

Evidence B: What is the bigger indicator that these indicators will contribute to?? At present lacks focus for ex Indicator 3 (Q13) - what does this mean in terms of action on the ground, what are the governance structures, how will their security be enhanced. Also does not include (at least not obvious) indicators for Batwa

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: The proponent is confident that the project will contribute to a long-term vision for sustainability. However, we need to consider this project as an important step and not expect sustainability to be achieved in the short-term.

Evidence B: It all sounds good - but lacks focus and at present not clear on how the results will happen, how will landscape governance be enhanced, what will the management insts be? will they have the rights and resps and so forth

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: This project is well aligned with NBSAP in term of conservation priorities of forest and freshwater ecosystems and models of implementation involving IPLC.

Evidence B: Will broadly contribute to NBSAP (less clear on NDC)- but the issue is focusing on a defined area and deliver strong results/outcomes over a defined area rather than weak results over a huge area. Results and learning from Defined area can then be used for upscaling in other areas

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: The proponent mentions gender in different sections of the document. A couple of IPLC groups selected as partners of the proponent are women-led and discrete activities are planned to reinforce the role of the women (and your people) in the management of the natural resources.

Evidence B: Reasonably well thought through - though will be stronger if the gender work contributes to enhance role of women in governance with rights and resps of the the ICCA areas

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The project is solid and concrete and well conceived which can be considered as the most important aspect to lead to success.

Evidence B: If they can focus on an achievable outcome(s) in a defined area - then this could be a very strong candidate for learning from to go to scale in the area. one key here is learning - communities, gov, NGOs - and this much more than M&E


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 31/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/40

Average Total Score: 28.5/40

Performance of Eol 301 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: The proponent is an NGO but all the other partners (5) are IPLC groups.

Evidence B: Seems to be a mix of partners - both IPLC and NGOs; and capacity of this partnership is one key area in the 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: CREDDHO has the right credentials to be the on-the ground leader of this project.

Evidence B: Only issue for me - is there seems to be a lack of governance (representation, accountability, institutions, participation and so forth) that will be critical for ICCA work. Also important role of participatory planning

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The proponent has five strong partner IPLC groups with experience in the management of natural resources in both forest and freshwater ecosystems.

Evidence B: A good range of IPLC partners identified (which would be trimmed down if they are to focus on one broad area). This can be brought together to enhance participatory ICCA management planning and governance

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: The technical capacity of the proponent and its partners is clearly established but the group does not have experience in managing GEF funded projects.

Evidence B: Will need capacity in safeguards - but that should not be a problem. for Full proposal will need Strat Planning, good ToC, focus on geography and on ICCA But many of the parts of a good project proposal are there already - just the focus on the what and the where

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: The proponent and its partners have a good experience in the financial management of projects, but the level of finance managed is still modest.

Evidence B: Looks as though they are used to having smaller projects up to 100K which might be a challenge if they get a full GEF for \$2mill - but that can be catered for in good project planning

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: NA/2

Evidence A: CREDDHO has no experience with the GEF or with any other large funding agency.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 301 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

