

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 5

Organization: CHEPKITALE

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
5	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	20	34	16	70
5	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	26	23	25	74

Performance of Eol 5 in East Africa Drylands - 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Kenya highlighted Mt Elgon as top priority KBA, the MT Elgon park is a KBA and has a very high Species Range-Size Rarity. It is not (part of) an Intact Forest Landscape.

Evidence B: This area comprises the last remaining indigenous forests and moorlands vegetation in the region. It is also part of

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

Reviewer A: NA/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: The area has a low score for Irrecoverable Carbon.

Evidence B: According to the UN Biodiversity Lab, the area has a consistently high area of soil above ground carbon (averaging between 100 - 125 t/ha).

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: 5/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: This proposal focuses on Chepkitale, the ancestral lands of the Ogiek Community of Mt. Elgon. This community was displaced from most of their lands they traditionally owned and was converted to protected areas. A tiny part (the moorlands up above the forest belt of Mt. Elgon) were set aside for the Ogiek of Chepkitale as Chepkitale Native Reserve. Traditionally, Chepkitale has been owned and used by the Ogiek community for all aspects of the community's wellbeing. As of 2013, the community has put together their community sustainability by-laws and governance structure to demonstrate to government how they have been taking care of their lands sustainably. The vision of the community is for their territories to be recognised as "Community Forest" under community Land Act 2016 and governed under their community bylaws.

Evidence B: According to the application, this is an IPLC governed area, with legal support under Kenya's Community Land Act in 2016.

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: Chepkitale holds immense cultural significance to the Ogiek Community of Mt. Elgon. Their history and traditions are intertwined with the land. It has been managed through traditional norms which guide on how the land and its resources are taken care of. As an example each clan has a totem which is a wild animal that must not be killed because it is seen as a member of a clan hence a natural way of protecting wildlife. Similarly, certain trees species are a taboo to be used as firewood.

Evidence B: The justification is a bit vague - it references traditional taboo areas, the importance for wild animal totems, and the importance for subsistence and traditional products.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The EOI identifies several threats to the area, such as environmental degradation because neighbours see the forest as a source for exploitation, e.g. for charcoal. Climate change is causing change in species behaviour and inconsistent weather and flowering of plants that affects their honey production. There is a lack of formal recognitions of Ogiek community's land and resource rights. The area scores high for cumulative development pressures. There are several major threats to biodiversity in Kenya in general, which lost 326kha (about 10%) of its tree cover from 2001 to 2018. according to Global Witness, at least 4 land defenders were killed in Kenya between 2016-2018.

Evidence B: The application makes the case that the area is threatened, primarily b/c of the lack of formal recognitions of Ogiek community's land and resource rights, the over-exploitation in surrounding areas of forest resources, and the Kenya Wildlife Service's desire to take the land rights under their control.

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: Kenya's legal framework recognizes the potential for IPLC ownership of land and control of forests - including as protected areas (Constitution of Kenya 2010, Community Land Act 2016, Kenya Forest and Management Act 2016, The National Land Policy on historical land injustices). For full recognition, the land must be mapped, surveyed and adjudicated. Government agencies and ministers appear to be in opposition to the recognition of IPLC ownership - with progress tending to require intense political pressure. (RRI 2020 Opportunity Framework).

Evidence B: It sounds like some rights for their governance are in place, and others are not. This sounds like a clash between the Community Land Act and the Kenya Wildlife Service, which is not surprising, given how siloed Kenya can be in their conservation work.

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: There is very limited IPLC support highlighted in CBD reports. The Kenya Forest Service see the communities as “government mercenaries” who have come to take away their lands, but the community works together with Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) on elephant protection.

Evidence B: NA

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: At present, the forests in the areas the community is still resident are better protected than those on the areas Kenya Forest Service manage. The Ogiek community use their lands communally and practice traditional means of livelihoods. This has enabled sustainability apart from the community adopting community bylaws that bind each community member on how land should be used and managed.

Evidence B: There are a number of IPLC-led conservation initiatives well documented throughout Kenya, including for example the Nashula Maasamarai Conservancy, Northern Rangeland Trusts, Community Conservation Resilience Initiatives and others. There have been 16 IPLC Equator Prize winners in Kenya.

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: The EOI mentions several projects that provide complementaery support for IPLC-led conservation in the geography and the Current Cofinancing Landscape shows 5 relevant projects in Kenya with a total funding of US\$ 131.3M.

Evidence B: This group is already working closely with IUCN, BMU and RRI on a number of projects that would align closely with project goals and investments.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 5 in East Africa Drylands - 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: All activities are well aligned with the overall objective and build on existing opportunities, experiences and achievements of the communities.

Evidence B: This project is aligned with the overall objectives of ICI - particular global environmental benefits include the conservation of globally significant biodiversity areas, high carbon density areas, and areas important for water conservation.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The proposed activities and expected results are created from a systemic and inclusive approach with a clear focus on the objective and clearly described.

Evidence B: This proposal clearly spells out what steps are needed to improve land rights and tenure, including implementing a 'rights-based approach,' an engagement platform for IPLCs, alignment with community and national by-laws, and better alignment between national agencies.

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: There is a clear link between activities and identified threats and a strong focus on enabling opportunities for IPLC-led conservation based on existing opportunities, experience and achievements.

Evidence B: Although ambitious, the project focuses on aligning by-laws. Given the extent of IPLC initiatives in Kenya, this seems to be realistic to accomplish for the budget and timeline.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The activities are mainly including advocacy, awareness-building, policy and stakeholder engagement and documentation, which all seems very doable within this budget range.

Evidence B: Five years should be more than sufficient to change by-laws and increase alignment in laws and policies, especially with the subsidiary proposal to include elements for consultation and IPLC participation.

5. Does the EoI 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: The organization is aware that it is very difficult to secure funding that supports rights based approach to conservation, but over the years built a relationship with some donors, including BMU-IKI, RRI and RFUND who accepted to support them and link them to other funders whenever opportunities present.

Evidence B: The current funding sources are well diversified, however, the section on co-finance is vague "We think there is great opportunity for us to get co-financing." More specificity would have been helpful.

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: The estimated total area under improved management is 138,000 ha.

Evidence B: The project is of moderate size, at around 130K 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The EOI describes clearly substantial cultural and livelihood benefits derived from the project goals, including documentation of traditional knowledge, mainstreaming of the Ogiek Community's traditional bylaws, satisfying their wood fuel needs within their farm, increasing income from sustainable livelihood activities and improved ecosystem services.

Evidence B: This section is very weak, with a few bullet points of additional cultural and livelihood benefits, without quantification or indicators.

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: This project ensures long-term sustainability through its systemic and inclusive approach and developing it in a way that it will attract support from the National Government and County Governments after project completion. The livelihood activities will be self sustaining after end of project life.

Evidence B: This section is very vague, simply stating: "This project will be developed in a way that it will attract support from the National Government and County Governments after project completion. The livelihood activities will be self sustaining after end of project life."

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:* 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: One of the guiding principles of Kenya's NBSAP states "Conservation goals are achieved through ecosystem approaches, particularly as managed by local communities who have used traditional methods to sustainably manage ecosystems for generations". The National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) places a lot of responsibilities on the Government of Kenya and civil society to work together in meeting the above policy statement.

Evidence B: The text weakly related actions to Kenya's NBSAP. This is unfortunate, b/c Kenya's NBSAP specifically includes references to community conserved areas, and states that Target 11 should include community conservation areas and conservancies, which are integrated into the national grid of protected areas, wider landscapes and seascapes. Kenya's NDC is still under revision, and the linkages for nature-based solutions are quite weak.

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: This project will be developed in a "self-determined" principle in mind, which includes that women issues activities will be determined in consultation with women during the project development phase. Gender mainstreaming will be adopted to achieve results by considering women, girls, boys and men's needs. Women will also be included and in the governance structures of the implementation of the project. However, there is no explanation about women's issues nor is gender mentioned in any of the activities.

Evidence B: Gender mainstreaming is limited to 'including women in the governance structure of the implementation committee,' and lacks a fundamental understanding of how gender could be effectively mainstreamed into the project.

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: 1/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The entire project is aiming at strengthening the IPLC leadership capacity based on their own traditional knowledge and additional community bylaws as well as acceptance of IPLC leadership by the wider community.

Evidence B: Although the project has the potential to be scaled up, the sole reference is in a single sentence, stating: "Support the domestication of the principle of "right's based approach to conservation" that was started through the IUCN's "Whakatane Mechanism" at Chepkitala. This will be developed to a learning tool that can be replicated elsewhere." It is not clear how it would be replicated, and what the potential is for replication.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 34/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/40

Average Total Score: 28.5/40

Performance of Eol 5 in East Africa Drylands - 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The applicant is an Indigenous Peoples Organization that will work closely with several community-based institutions such as the Chepkitale Ogiek Council of Elders, Chepkitale Ogiek Governing Council, Chepkitale Women Group and some self help groups. The project builds on their own knowledge and working experience.

Evidence B: This is made clear throughout the application.

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: The organization has a track record of 17 years relevant on-ground leadership and its board members' leadership experience is even longer. The organization coordinates at least one network of local IPLC organizations, community-based organizations or other civil society groups, which is active nationwide and has relevant project experience.

Evidence B: The work of the Chepkitale Indigenous People Development Project appears to have a 17-year track record, a history of success in raising funds and promoting dialogue, and success with land use and tenure changes.

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The partners however all appear to be very local, and with exception of one group, all connected with the same Chepkitale group.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The organization has demonstrated relevant experience with all project components, has project management experience, but does not have experience with GEF projects

Evidence B: They appear to have successfully executed projects before, but they lack GEF experience.

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 organization has diversified funding streams (including Rights and Resources Initiative, IUCN and Rainforest Fund), annual external audits, but no project over \$200,000,

Evidence B: They have a strong foundation of management and finance capacity, but have yet to handle a large project over \$200K.

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: The organization has an ongoing IUCN supported project that has safeguard policies in place.

Evidence B: The group has an ongoing IUCN project with safeguards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 20.5/30

Performance of Eol 5 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

