

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 151

Organization: Kitara Civil Society Organisations Network (KCSO)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Sinegugu Zukulu	151	East Africa Drylands	Uganda	8	5	14	27
Leo van der Vlist	151	East Africa Drylands	Uganda	9	19	9	37

Performance of Eol 151 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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The area is Key Biodiversity area and also high species rarity.

Evidence B: The area covers seven districts in the mid albertine region in Uganda and these includes Masindi, Hoima, Buliisa, Kikuube, Kagadi, Kibaaale and Kyenjojo districts. These districts belong to the western arm of the rift valley and is home to many plant and animal species that are endemic to the region. These include the mountain gorilla, mountain monkey, golden monkey and 42 species of birds as well as many reptiles, amphibians and fish. Additionally, the mountains and forests in this region are important watersheds for the supply of regular and clean water to both surrounding and distant communities. The area has a very high Species Range-Size Rarity. Some parts of it are KBA's. It is not part of 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: NA/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: >50 t/ha - Low; There is low irrecoverable Carbon in the area.

Evidence B: Parts of the area have moderate 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: NA/5 Reviewer B: NA/5

Average: NaN/5

Evidence A: There is no evidence of IPLC governance in the area. There are no formally recognized IPLC lands in the area.

Evidence B: The EoI only speaks in general terms about cultural diversity and indigenous and traditional peoples.

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

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: No explanation has been given in the application.

Evidence B: The EoI only speaks in general terms about cultural diversity and indigenous and traditional peoples in relation to conservation.

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: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: There is a threat of cumulative development pressure in the area.

Evidence B: EoI mentions that the major threats affecting the proposed areas include, Land degradation, Deforestation and forest degradation, Environmental pollution, Deterioration of aquatic ecosystems, climate change and oil exploitation. No information on situation of IPLC's in the area. Medium high Cumulative Development Pressures. There is considerable forest loss in the area during the period 2000–2019. Two small land deals in the area identified. From 2001 to 2018 Uganda lost 781kha of tree cover, equivalent to a 10 percent decrease in tree cover since 2000.

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);

Evidence B: CBD reports highlight some national IPLC support actions. While the Ugandan legal framework recognizes IPLC ownership of land and does not require land to be registered, it retains control over forests and other natural resources, while allowing for some degree of community forest and collaborative forest management. (RRI 2020)

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: There is some willingness.

Evidence B: 13.45 MHa are recognized by the government as owned by IPLCs representing 67% of the country's total land area. Given the nature of legal recognition in Uganda this is the majority if not the totality of claims. (RRI 2015) There is no basis for assessing if there is government interest in implementing projects for collective land rights. However, there is a certain degree of willingness to establish projects aimed at forest conservation and protection of IPLC forest tenure rights. Decision making is centralized - so sub-national data is not necessary. (RRI 2020) The EoI mentions that District Environment Action Plans prepared for seven target districts, include to empower 40% of communities in the northern Albertine rift to participate in natural resources management by 2015, Build capacity and enable 40% of the households in target areas of the northern Albertine rift actively to practise sustainable management of natural resources by 2018. However, no clear support for or examples of IPLC-led conservation mentioned in EoI.

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

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: There is no such evidence in the application.

Evidence B: No examples of IPLC-led conservation mentioned in EoI.

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:* 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: There are other projects in the landscape.

Evidence B: Only two remotely related projects are mentioned and the organization can contribute existing protected area staff time, vehicle, and motorcycles and donor initiatives to strengthen protected area management e.g infrastructure development etc.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 8/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 9/30

Average Total Score: 8.5/30

Performance of Eol 151 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: It is partially aligned: The approach proposed is too theoretical or workshop based that practical implementation.

Evidence B: The EoI mentions in Q 10 that the indigenous people of Uganda experience challenges, especially in relation to the lack of security in land tenure and marginalization in terms of political representation. However, in the activities mentioned in Q 8 the land tenure is poorly addressed. The activities focus on engaging IPLCs more in nature conservation, but do not seem to aim for IPLC-led 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: The approach is mainly based on running trainings as opposed to practical or physical implementation.

Evidence B: Without addressing the land tenure and no clear focus on IPLC-led conservation the activities are likely to contribute to better engagement of IPLCs in nature conservation, but not achieving the objective of IPLC-led conservation.

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: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Objectives and activities do not clearly address identified threats and opportunities;

Evidence B: The project will enhance the engagement of IPLCs in nature conservation but does not provide any information on IPLC's views or practices on the subject, lacks a focus on land tenure and is limited to IPLC's bringing recommendations to the government, not really aiming for IPLC-led 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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment. (It does not necessarily build capacity of IPCL towards conservation.)

Evidence B: The planned activities seem achievable within this budget range. The budget range is somewhat bigger than projects the organization has done before.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Co-financing may be possible from the other projects that are available, within this organization.

Evidence B: The EoI mentions two other donors for potential co-funding and lists some 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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Not provided and not tangible.

Evidence B: Total area under improved management is estimated at 3,670,000 hectares. This seems big in relation to the budget-range.

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

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: Not convincing.

Evidence B: EoI mentions mainly indicators related to environmental awareness, not really cultural or livelihood indicators, apart from providing opportunities for loans to buy tree seedlings.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The main focus is on trainings, not implementation of practical conservation activities.

Evidence B: The EoI mentions some actions for long-term sustainability, including : establishing community revolving funds (but this is not mentioned in the activities), community capacity building, and creating an enabling policy and legislative environment at all levels, but this is also not clearly developed in the activities, especially in relation to tenure rights.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The project is weakly related to either national priorities; (It does but is weak on conservation activities.)

Evidence B: The EoI does not mention NBSAPs or NDC of Uganda but only provides some information on role of community regulatory systems and incentives model that benefit communities that provide stewardship in the biodiversity and ecosystem management policies . The information provided is also not clearly linked to 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Gender mainstreaming approach is weak (It is too theoretical in approach).

Evidence B: The EoI elaborates on their gender mainstreaming in general: All policies, programs and activities are supposed to benefit both men and women equally. Through training and sharing of lessons learned, the project will enhance understanding of the different roles and responsibilities, relationships, needs and interests of women and men. While working with local communities, a culturally sensitive approach that respects and takes into account the different roles and entitlements of women and men involved and/or affected by the project will be applied. In working with partners the project will ensure that the partners justify how planned activities will promote women's rights and gender equality among the project beneficiaries. The EoI does not clarify how this will be implemented in the proposed 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: It would not yield the desired demonstration (Conservation by IPLC).

Evidence B: The project includes investment in IPLC leadership, such as conduct lobbying and advocacy trainings, develop research to inform advocacy and train people in areas for enhancing IPLC rights and governance of natural resources, but does not seem to build on IPLC's own knowledge and visions.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 5/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/40

Average Total Score: 12/40

Performance of Eol 151 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: NA/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: Weak partnership with IPLC. The region earmarked for implementation is huge but there are no strong links with IP organizations on the ground.

Evidence B: It is not clear who are the members of KCSON, but the EoI speaks of beneficiary communities (Q 19) which is why it seems that IPLC appear to be beneficiaries only. The proposed partners do not seem to be IPLC organizations either.

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: This is purely NGO led work. It does not clearly relate to IP on the ground

Evidence B: The EoI mentions that project staff and partners have adequate expertise to implement the project as they have previously been engaged in similar work, but does not elaborate on that statement. The organisation coordinates at least one network of local IPLC organizations, community-based organizations or other civil society groups, which is active in one or more regions of the country. Previous project implementation demonstrates capacity building of civil society in general but not clearly aimed at promoting their self-organization and not mentioning indigenous peoples.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 1/5

Evidence A: No partners in implementation have been identified and their role clearly defined.

Evidence B: The two proposed partners do not seem to be IPLC organizations; Mpanga Conservation Development Organization and Uganda Rural Development Training Program.

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: They have capacity to do the job, but the question is whether the job to be done is worth the money being applied.

Evidence B: KCSON staff has management, environmental, development and M&E qualifications, but no demonstrated qualifications with local cultures.

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: Though financial statements may be late but they do do external auditing.

Evidence B: KCSON average annual budget for 2018, 2019 & 2020 is US\$ 555,556. The largest annual budget of any project that the organisation is currently implementing is US\$100,000 to US\$1 million per year. The organisation's funding comes from at least three sources, with no one source providing more than 60%. The organisation regularly produces financial reports and statements, which it makes available to the board and management, but these are often incomplete or delivered late. External audits are conducted on a periodic basis. The organization has at least 2 projects 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: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Not sure.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 9/30

Average Total Score: 11.5/30

Performance of Eol 151 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

