

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 150

Organization: The South Rift Association of Land Owners (SORALO)

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Agnes Leina	150	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	21	34	21	76
ELIFURAHA LALTAIKA	150	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	24	32	21	77

Performance of Eol 150 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* South Rift is a huge piece of conservation area well outlined in the global maps with a high and diverse ecosystem and a substantial variety of species worth conserving

*Evidence B:*1. The proposed area envisages biodiversity hotspots, including breeding grounds for endangered lesser flamingo. Additionally, the area spanning from Southern Kenya to Northern Tanzania, supports the richest mammal diversity in the world. It is thus of high significance

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:* Way greater than 100Ha and well researched data to back it up

*Evidence B:*2. The EOI envisages restoring resilience of 3.5 Million hectares of rangelands while simultaneously forest loss in an area covering 150,000 hectares. This is thus a high carbon value based on the scoring figures above.

### 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The applicant has explained very well how the land is managed by IPLCs which is very much the case but the fact remains that with the new land adjudication systems, and governance, IPLCs management of their lands and natural resources is limited in the sense that forests and mountains are managed under Kenya Forest Management and Wildlife in the Serengeti and Amboseli are largely managed by Kenya Wildlife Service-KWS under Kenyan Laws and policies for the management of the same.

*Evidence B:*3. As described in the EOI, the area is actively governed by IPLC. Similarly, the traditional governance systems features prominently in practice. This is because, while Kenyan state laws also apply in the area, traditional governance system remains strong.

**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:* the applicant concentrated on explaining the traditional governance system very well and unfortunately forgot to explain the cultural significance. they only managed to explain the grazing significance -(eramatara)

*Evidence B:*4. While the EOI provides a clear and succinct historical account and traditional management of the area, it vaguely describes the area's cultural significance. For example, it omits to show whether the area comprises sacred sites.

**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:* Habitat loss, land fragmentation, cultural erosion, population growth among other threats are mentioned

*Evidence B:*5. Habitat loss and land fragmentation, compounded by climate change and its impacts are risks that can negatively impact on biodiversity if no action is taken. These are compounded by population growth and human-wildlife conflicts

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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* There are very good and very supportive regulations but they all lack an implementation framework. Very good on paper but must reflect the same in reality

*Evidence B:*6. Kenyan laws recognize customary tenure on the basis of which IPLC-led conservation in the area covered by the EOI can take place. However, robust ownership presupposes titling, and a lot still needs to be done in this area.

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:* For instance the National Wildlife Strategy (2018) recognises the value of communities in wildlife management. The community land act if implemented can allow for community to own land. There is still a long way to go and there is a window of opportunity

*Evidence B:7.* As convincingly expressed in the EOI, Kenya's legal and policy landscape supports IPLC-led conservation. This support has strong roots in the constitution and reflected in the wildlife policy and the community Land Act of 2016.

## 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* A period of 12 years is good enough to implement some activities that the project can build upon

*Evidence B:8.* The applicant organization has piloted a project in two communities. The pilot projects have proved that communal land governance is compatible to wildlife conservation of natural resources and co existence of wildlife and people.

## 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:* With 5 co- financed activities, the projects provide complimentary support to the IPLC led project

*Evidence B:9.* The EOI is replete with relevant projects that are relevant and complementary to the project described in the EOI. These are funded by, among others, IUCN-SOS and the Lion Recovery Fund.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 150 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* All very well outlined in the EoI

*Evidence B:* Activities described are well thought out and inclusive. It is thus clear that once implemented, they would up-scale the twin objectives of the ICI.

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: 4/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* Very well outlined set of activities with clear outcomes all IPLC -centred

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities are convincingly aligned to the expected outcomes. They are achievable within the proposed timeline.

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:* Top notch explanation outlined very clearly– its focused on IPLC leadership and governance, management and cultural and knowledge impacts respectively.

*Evidence B:* The EOI proposes a multi-pronged approach which, gauged from activities proposed and objectives, it is convincingly clear that it would contribute to overcoming stumbling blocks standing on the way of IPLC's conservation initiatives.

#### 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Yes as outlined above, consistently and quite achievable

*Evidence B:* Activities and results are generally well aligned, and can be implemented within the proposed budget lines. However, the aspect of retention of cultural values compatible to conservation needed more explanation in terms of budgetary needs.

#### 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 actual amount of co-financing is not outlined but there is mention of some 5 co-financiers



*Evidence B:* An impressive list of donations relevant to the proposed project appears in the EOI, including on ecosystem connectivity funded by the IUCN and National Geographic. Combined with in-kind contribution by communities, it is clear that the EOI include concrete sources of co-funding.

**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:* Total area is very high its 1.190,000Ha

*Evidence B:* The total area under improved management (hectares) proposed by the EOI is 1,190,00. This is very high, based on scores above.

**7. Are the additional cultural and livelihoods results contributing to project objectives?**

*Scoring:*

- No provided cultural or livelihood indicators for the project;
- Indicators proposed but are not clearly aligned with project goals;
- Indicators proposed and are moderately aligned with project goals;
- Additional cultural and/or livelihood indicators clearly derive from project goals

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Very well outlined as per strategy. The question was very well understood and well answered

*Evidence B:* The indicators are moderately aligned with the project. Missing for example, include specific cultural and livelihoods indicators such as retention of conservation compatible lifestyles or livelihoods.

**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:* They have outlined this very well

*Evidence B:* The EOI is convincingly clear on strategies to ensure gains will survive expiration of the project funding. They include tapping on established community governance structures, leveraged by emerging sources of donor funds. The two sources however, are not desegregated.

### 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* They have demonstrated this very well and even outlined that it could lead to the first Kenya jurisdiction carbon project in the south Rift

*Evidence B:* The EOI reflects a clear understanding of the country's legal and policy framework, international commitments and how the EOI is likely to contribute to their advancement. For example, it refers to Kenya's AFR100 commitments and aim at contributing to Kenya's climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies.

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

## **Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The only mention of women inclusivity is the La-leok resource center, there is no mention of them in any form of leadership but only as beneficiaries

*Evidence B:* No mention appears of how women will be involved in key leadership position, hence take part in decision making. The EOI is replete with examples and importance of women inclusion without concretely mentioning stages at which they would be involved, for example while designing priorities or only during implementation.

### 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: 4/5*

## **Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The Activities are highly innovative and result oriented

*Evidence B:* Overall, the EOI presents innovative solutions to threats facing IPLC and biodiversity. For example, it proposes to strengthen unclear land tenure systems in order to enable IPLC to steward their natural resources and their future.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 34/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 33/40

Performance of Eol 150 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6*

**Average: 6/6**

*Evidence A:* No mention of any NGO in the leadership of this EoI

*Evidence B:* The organization's general assembly comprises of leaders of the IPLC. Additionally, the director is a member of the IPLC in question. There is thus no doubt that it is an IPLC-led organization.

### 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:* The leadership is well explained and very well demonstrated relevance to the work and level of professionalism well stated with the number of years in the service

*Evidence B:* Both the previous projects implemented and connection of the organization's staff/leadership to the IPLC in question demonstrate on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work.

### 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: 1/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* The Board, the director, the Coordinator and and head of Coexistence are all very skilled professionals from the grassroots to national and international levels

*Evidence B:* The lead proponent does not include IPLC's community-based organizations as proposed partners and the role they may play. It lists an international organization and a conservancies association (envisioned to provide technical support).

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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* Based on the projects implemented in the past as well as bios of key officials, it is clear that the key proponent and its partners have full technical capacity to implement the proposed project.

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: 6/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* 100,000 USDs annually

*Evidence B:* The main proponent's annual budget that is currently implementing is between US\$100,000-1,000,000. Its funds come from at least 10 sources with no source providing more than 20%.

## 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: NaN/2**

*Evidence A:* They answered no to this

*Evidence B:* The organization's answer is no, indicating that it has no experience with safeguards and other standards required by GEF.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 21/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 21/30

Performance of Eol 150 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

