

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 69

Organization: ASSOCIATION OKANI

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
69	Congo Basin	Cameroon	4			4
69	Congo Basin	Cameroon	7			7
69	Congo Basin	Cameroon	21	17	25	63

Performance of Eol 69 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5 Reviewer C: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Project area encompasses several KBAs

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: This is an area of high biodiversity significance of Cameroon, primarily for the species range-size rarity and proximity to key biodiversity areas.

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 Reviewer C: 2/2

Average: 1.33/2

Evidence A: Based on irrecoverable carbon map

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: The average score of carbon density is well above 100 t/ha.s

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 2/5 Reviewer C: 2/2

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: No addressed

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*This is an IP NGO with a long track record, held and managed with strong and active IPLC governance systems.

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: NA/2 Reviewer B: NA/2 Reviewer C: NA/2

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: No

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Information is non-existent, except for this sentence: "Baka communities are culturally and historically different from other Bantu communities and with which they share the same geographical territory and practice many material, ritual and symbolic exchanges."

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: NA/5 Reviewer C: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: No discussion of threats in this EOI

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*It is clear this area is at high risk, including from existing palm oil concessions.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 1/3 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Q 4 and 5 left blank

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*The legal and policy frameworks are actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance, as evidenced by section 3.s

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 1/3 Reviewer C: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Q 4 and 5 left blank

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Yes - the Memo of Understanding shows the active support. There are multiple examples of IPLC-led conservation in the area.

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

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: Q 4 and 5 left blank

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Yes - there are multiple IPLC-led conservation initiatives in the area. There are 8 IPLC initiatives in the Equator Prize database.

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: NA/2 *Reviewer B:* NA/3 *Reviewer C:* NA/3

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: No complementary activities were reported. RFUK has a mobile phone reporting system ForestLink to enable communities to report illegal activities and human rights abuses - this seems largely to replicate this work <https://www.mappingforrights.org/forestlink/> (<https://www.mappingforrights.org/forestlink/>)

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*This is not clear from the proposal.

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 4/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 7/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 10.67/30

Performance of Eol 69 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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Basically this is a grievance reporting system

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*The list of proposal actions and the overall approach is well aligned, and follows a clear theory of change.

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: NA/6 Reviewer B: NA/6 Reviewer C: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Left blank

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*The actions focus on monitoring as a means of empowerment, and each step is clearly elaborated.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Left blank

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*The objectives focus on monitoring, but do not address the root causes of forest loss.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: No idea how to reply to this

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*This is entirely feasible within the budget and timeline.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Very vague elaboration of co-financing.

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: NA/5 *Reviewer B:* NA/5 *Reviewer C:* 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*Although the size of the area is very large, and would warrant a very high score, the actual transformational impact is not commensurate, hence a lower score.

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

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: NA

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*The proposal does not include cultural or livelihood 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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: NA/3

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

*Evidence C:*This is not well justified in the proposal.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

*Evidence C:*Although there is much scope within the NBSAP and NDC, these are not clearly elaborated in the proposal.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: NA/3

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

Evidence C:Poor definition of a gender mainstreaming strategy.

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: NA/5 Reviewer C: 1/5

Average: 1/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

Evidence C:The potential for monitoring as a transformative action is enormous, however the proposal did not make a strong case.

Section 2:


Reviewer A Total Score: NA/40

Reviewer B Total Score: NA/40

Reviewer C Total Score: 17/40

Average Total Score: 17/40

Performance of Eol 69 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: NA/6 Reviewer C: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

Evidence C:Yes, this is an IP-led NGO.

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: NA/6 Reviewer B: NA/6 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

Evidence C:Yes, this is an IP-led NGO.

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: NA/5 Reviewer C: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

*Evidence C:*There is a strong focus in IPLC partnerships, although this section could have been better elaborated in the proposal.

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: NA/5 Reviewer C: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

*Evidence C:*Although the appicate has not GEF experience, it has a solid track record of working with grants, and a large annual budget of 1 million USD. The skills and experiece appear to be sufficient to manage a large grant.

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: NA/6 Reviewer B: NA/6 Reviewer C: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

*Evidence C:*They have managed multiple large grants, including greater than 200K USD, they have experience with diversified funding streams, and they conduct annual audits.

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 Reviewer C: NA/2

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B:NA

*Evidence C:*They did not answer this question, so one must presume no.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: NA/30

Reviewer B Total Score: NA/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 69 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

