

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 222

Organization: PRODEA – Programa de Desenvolvimento Ambiental

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Sinegugu Zukulu	222	Coastal East Africa	Mozambique	15	25	17	57
Leo van der Vlist	222	Coastal East Africa	Mozambique	17	28	19	64

Performance of Eol 222 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score



Section 1 - Experience & strengths relevant to the proposed Indigenous territory, landscape/seascape (Total Points: 30)

A) Importance of the landscape/seascape/indigenous territory for biodiversity, with additional consideration to climate benefits.

1. Is the proposed territory/landscape/seascape a globally important area for biodiversity?

Scoring:

- Not significant;
- Low Significance;
- Moderate Significance;
- Medium-high Significance;
- High Significance;
- Exceptional Significance

Reviewer A: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: The region has patches or pockets of key Biodiversity areas.

Evidence B: The project area are the districts of Mocuba, Lugela, Alto Molocué and Derre in the province of Zambézia in Mozambique. The Project will pay more attention to the district of Derre, characterized by the existence of a Nature Reserve Forestry, not yet legalized by the government. An important reservoir of renewable energy and carbon, which guarantees the existence of a variety of flora, in addition to being an important resource of several raw materials, the forest plays a fundamental role in supporting ecosystems, integrating the recycling of nutrients, the production of oxygen and influences the climate, thus benefiting the families of the communities. The area is not a KBA, has a medium Species Range-Size Rarity and not an 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: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: There are moderate pocket areas of irrecoverable carbon in forested areas.

Evidence B: The area scores low on Irrecoverable Carbon

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: 1/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: The area is occupied by IPLC who live in the forests. But Mozambique as a country has not formally registered or recognized IPLC areas.

Evidence B: The national policy on forests and wildlife and the agrarian policy allows the involvement of local communities in the management and conservation of forest and wildlife resources. The IPLCs are organized in local councils and CGRN (Natural Resource Management Committee) with responsibility for controlling / protect and promote sustainable resource management at the community level, but their influence is very limited. Correct implementation of agrarian, forestry and wildlife policies is believed to increase the potential for improving the living conditions of local communities, with aspects such as the promotion of sustainable agriculture, the promotion of planting trees for energy purposes, production and efficient use of biomass energy, sustainable management of forest conservation areas, among others, which will reduce deforestation and forest degradation and contributing to nature conservation.

4. Does the proposal explain the unique cultural significance of the area to IPLCs?

Scoring:

- No explanation given of unique significance to IPLCs;
- Significance of site(s) vaguely described;
- Unique significance of project site(s) clearly explained

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

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: To a limited extent, yes.

Evidence B: Q2 of the EoI mentions the importance of the area for livelihood of LCs but does not address cultural aspects: 90% of rural energy comes from firewood and coal and more than 80% of the population uses the goods and services offered by biodiversity for their survival. In Q 13 one cultural value is mentioned: within the forest areas, there are some sacred trees of cultural value for the local communities.

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: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Deforestation or clearing of forests for cropping is the major threat to forests. Also very high cumulative development pressure.

Evidence B: Commercial monoculture agriculture, logging, firewood and charcoal production, uncontrolled burning and hunting are identified as the main threats to forest and wildlife resources in this part of the country. The main indirect causes at the level of proposed communities include limited knowledge and awareness of values and potential of biodiversity and the trend of demographic and economic growth, expansion and urbanization. The area has significant forest loss between 2000-2019, is subject to medium to very high cumulative development pressures, and several smaller and large land deals. According to Global Witness at least one land defender has been killed in Mozambique between 2016-2018.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Major interventions mention are those driven from outside such as UNFCCC, REDD+ etc

Evidence B: Mozambique's legal framework allows for the recognition of IPLC ownership of lands (DUATs) and control of forests (community forest concessions) (RRI 2015). While recognition of customary rights is established in law, full recognition requires a specific process of demarcation. ~19.1 Mha of land have been recognized by the government as owned by IPLCs and with another 1 Mha of forest land recognized as under IPLC control. In total, this represents approximately 25% of the country's total area. (RRI 2015) According to Landmark, about half of customarily-administered lands have yet to be recognized. Land demarcation and delimitation initiatives have also been developed in the project area in order to guarantee land tenure and

enhancement of family rights through the ITC-F (Community Land Initiative) which developed an idea called “Delimitation, land demarcation and micro zoning of resources” developed in various districts of the province of Zambézia, promoting the participation of families and sharing its benefits. The Conservation Policy at the level of Mozambique has the general objective of developing and consolidating a national system for the conservation of biological resources and their aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity contributing to life support, economic growth and poverty eradication. Government actions are still very moderate due to weak coordination between sectors and weak ability to integrate climate change issues into planning and budgeting and concrete implementation. All project actions will be related to the national strategic plan for the reduction and emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, forest conservation and increased reserves of carbon through forests (REDD +). The actions will be based on the integration of communities in decision-making forums, community surveillance of forest resources and training and awareness campaigns, but also with the practice of sustainable agriculture.

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 recognition of National Biodiversity Economy though limited.

Evidence B: CBD reports highlight that some programmes on community management of natural resources are being implemented. RRI provided no data on government willingness. The government through the MozFip project (Forest Investment Program) has financed some activities in establishment of new multiple-use forests. At district level, SDAE (District economic activity services) in partnership with some non-governmental organizations active in local communities, has made available personnell and seeds to assist various producers in local communities with their agricultural production. Natural resource management committees (CGRN) have developed several community initiatives with the support from district, provincial government, civil society and the private sector, providing 20% benefits from logging to the communities which they use, for example, for opening water sources, and education.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Some work has been done.

Evidence B: The system of implantation of forest nurseries at the community level was a well embraced initiative and is being replicated by different community members in the context of environmental reforestation and recovery of degraded areas. Families were supported through CGRNs in adopting efficient strategies on the use of energy and biomass, implementing the production and use of improved stoves to save use of firewood and charcoal by rural families, and the actions are being replicated by different communities, due to the understanding of the enormous advantages that the model offers.

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: 1/2 *Reviewer B:* 2/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Good foundation has been laid.

Evidence B: The EoI lists 4 strongly related other projects, 3 funded by World Bank. The EoI does not explain in-kind contributions, but explains that the diversity of existing resources in the proposed areas is enormous and can improve the way of life of local communities by increasing their income and generating opportunities of job. These regions where the project is implemented are characterized by an abundance of natural resources especially forest and wildlife, used irrationally by families, as a result of the lack of knowledge of their rights related to it. The current co-financing landscape lists 4 projects for a total of US\$ 115.3M, including a Dedicated Grant Mechanism for Local Communities for US\$4.5M


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 15/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 16/30

Performance of Eol 222 in Coastal East Africa - 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: It speaks directly to ICI focus areas.

Evidence B: The project is well aligned because the set of activities include empowering the IPLCs (CGRN) in matters of rights and land use, and environmental, forestry and agrarian legislation and ensuring the rights of Derre district communities on land and other natural resources, besides livelihood improvement and nature conservation activities.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: There is a good plan to involve the people residing in the forest.

Evidence B: The results and activities are very comprehensive and clearly presented.

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

Scoring:

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

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: It will address the threats but Mozambique is a country with high poverty levels so this might not be enough to overcome challenges.

Evidence B: The project makes use of enabling opportunities to strengthen land use rights of IPLCs and clearly address the threats identified through activities that both contribute to livelihood improvements as well as nature conservation. .

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: It will help to reduce threats in the targeted region.

Evidence B: The Eol states the budget range is sufficient, however, the applicant has also provided a preliminary 3 year budget that demonstrates the project would fall below that range.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Due to poverty levels shortage of other donor investments in the country there might not be enough co-financing resources.

Evidence B: Significant sources of co-funding by donors, but no demonstrated in-kind contributions.

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: To a certain extent, yes.

Evidence B: The estimated total area under improved management is 190,000 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: 2/3 *Reviewer B:* 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There is quite a good cultural benefit that would emerge.

Evidence B: The EoI mentions that in the implementation phase of the project, priority will be given and respect for the region's cultural traditions and values. Within the forest areas, there are some sacred trees of cultural value for the local communities. The project will develop mechanisms to support culture in the beneficiary communities in order to transmit these cultural values to society. Traditional knowledge and practices of use and conservation of biodiversity will be respected, preserved and protected, and their access should be promoted in line with the national legal framework and customary standards. The EoI does not clearly express how this will be achieved and no actions seem to be aiming to do that. Q13 does not mention livelihood indicators, but these are clear from the planned activities and results.

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: It lays very good foundation for future funding.

Evidence B: The EoI explains that the interaction, inclusion and the guarantee of community participation in the planning processes of the activities, training and capacity building on agrarian laws, the awareness of peoples regarding rights over the sustainable use of natural resources and the creation and legalization of management committees natural resources and agricultural associations can guarantee the sustainability / continuity of the project in the following periods. Basketry, carpentry and beekeeping activities will be introduced so that communities have economic gains that guarantee the continuity of the project. At the same time the EoI expresses its intention to design a second phase that will focus on improving and continuity of some actions.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: It does....

Evidence B: The EoI explains how the project will contribute to Mozambique's REDD+ and NBSAP strategies and policies but does not mention the NDC.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There is good foundation to be laid, but not without challenges.

Evidence B: The organization, in the implementation of activities, will privilege women, especially women widows and / or the most disadvantaged, because in the community context, women have been discriminated against with regard to access to land and other natural resources. The project aims to include gender in the decision-making process decisions regarding forestry, environmental and institutional policies ensuring that women develop their skills in various activities, actively participating in the workshops and all meetings created by the project, thus improving living conditions. The project aims to empower women and support them in various project activities, such as support for selling NTFPs in the local market, production of improved stoves and ovens, pottery and basketry and creation of groups savings and revolving credit.

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 forest people need these interventions if they are sustain lives and natural resources that they so dependent on.

Evidence B: The projects invests considerably in IPLC leadership through support in land use rights, training and awareness on livelihood improvement and environmental conservation. The scale could be bigger as the budget and project duration are below the potential ranges in this call.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/40

Average Total Score: 26.5/40

Performance of Eol 222 in Coastal East Africa - 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: This work will directly be done by IPLCs but Mozambique as a country has not formally recognized IPLCs

Evidence B: The organization is an environmental and development organization with staff qualified in forestry and agrarian sector with experience in training and raising awareness of communities. The application includes three handwritten letters, which appear to be adhesions to the project by community leaders, but these are in Portuguese and could not be translated by the reviewer. Local CBOs are among the partners and are stated to take ownership of the project and ensure that communities in general have access to resources through the dissemination of laws. Local leaders are also included as partners to facilitate the implementation of the activities of the project at the grassroots level and support the Community explanation of its objectives. The activities include ensuring land use rights and rights to resources and capacity building of IPLCs.

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: They have demonstrated good experience in the past 15 years of existence.

Evidence B: The organization has one or more projects led by PICL, but these are driven from its base in an urban center. The organization coordinates at least one network of local PICL organizations, grassroots organizations community or other civil society groups, which is active in one or more regions of the country. The three projects presented in Q 29 demonstrate leadership in the proposed work.

C) Proven relevant experience in working with IPLC networks, alliances and organizations/ strength of partnerships on the ground.

3. Does Eol demonstrate that the lead proponent has strong partnerships, particularly with other IPLC organizations, to carry out the work?

Scoring:

- No partners defined;
- No IPLC partners identified;
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners but without clear scope (roles in project design or governance);
- IPLC organizations are listed as implementing partners with clear roles (in project design or governance);
- Strong IPLC partnerships that play a central role in design, governance, and implementation of the project;
- Strong IPLC partnerships have a central role in design, governance and implementation of the project and linkages with national or regional IPO networks

Reviewer A: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Not really defined but clear there is a good understanding of situations on the ground and need to involve IPLCs.

Evidence B: Local CBOs are among the partners and are stated to take ownership of the project and ensure that communities in general have access to resources through the dissemination of laws. Local leaders are also included as partners to facilitate the implementation of the activities of the project at the grassroots level and support the Community explanation of its objectives. The activities include ensuring land use rights and rights to resources and capacity building of IPLCs.

D) Technical expertise and capacity to address environmental problems, root causes and barriers.

4. Does Eol 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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The team has full capacity in all aspects.

Evidence B: The presented skills of applicant and partners and experience of past projects demonstrate full capacity. The Eol states that the organization has already taken part or implemented projects financed by the GEF.

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: From what has been said yes. The gap is on annual annual financial audits involving outside companies.

Evidence B: During PRODEA's 15 years of existence, it has implemented several projects and with various organizations, having reached 687,505.79USD to date and have been disbursed on average annually 45,833.72USD. There are years when they were disbursed well above this average and others very low. Scale of ongoing projects is between \$ 10,000 to \$ 100,000 per year. The organization's funding comes from at least three sources, with no source that provide more than 60%. The organization has a system for producing financial reports and statements, but these are produced sporadically in response to donor demand. No audits are performed external. In the past two projects were over \$200,000,.

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: They promised to have implemented GEF work before.

Evidence B: Answered yes, but with no explanation.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 17/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 18/30

Performance of Eol 222 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

