

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 106

Organization: REPADES-JAC

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Claudio C. Maretti	106	Coastal East Africa	Mozambique	14	15	22	51
Jamison, Ervin	106	Coastal East Africa	Mozambique	27	35	24	86

Performance of Eol 106 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: There are some areas of species importance and few KBAs. But there is no information on IFL. Besides, the project focus area is not clear in the proposal.

Evidence B: The primary significance are the coastal and marine areas, especially for fisheries.

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

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Some high level carbon areas in the Mozambique land coast. But the project focus area is not completely clear in the proposal.

Evidence B: Primarily through blue carbon/mangroves, sea grass beds and coral

B) Geographical focus in an area under IPLC governance.

3. Is the area held and managed by IPLC under community-based governance systems?

Scoring:

- IPLC governance (rights and institutions) not evident;
- Project areas are marginally under IPLC governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are partially under IPLC systems of governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are largely under IPLC governance, but IPLC rights and/or institutions face significant constraints;
- Project areas are held and managed under IPLC governance systems, with some limitations;
- Project areas are held and managed under strong and active IPLC governance systems

Reviewer A: 1/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Although there is some information in the tabular resources, there is none in the map. And in the project proposal this is not clear enough.

Evidence B: There appear to be 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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The project proposal includes general statements, mostly based on copying reports. The project focus communities and area are not completely clear in the proposal.

Evidence B: Primarily for fisheries

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: The score in the cumulative development pressures and in the text (table) guided me to conclude the level of the threats.

Evidence B: The recent discovery of hydrocarbon /gas warrants a high threat ranking

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: Although there is no clarity on legal framework to protect IPLCs, the proposal states community-based interests and possibilities.

Evidence B: There is a strong history of locally managed marine areas in place, with effective IPLC governance

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: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Not enough clear, but supposedly so.

Evidence B: There appears to be strong support

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Not enough clear. By the proposal text, one can only suppose there is some level of action and initial success.

Evidence B: There are numerous examples. See <https://cordioea.net/locally-managed-marine-areas/> (<https://cordioea.net/locally-managed-marine-areas/>)

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: There are other projects in the supposed region. The connections are not clear enough – including because the project proposal is not clear enough.

Evidence B: There are numerous examples - see <https://cordioea.net/locally-managed-marine-areas/> (<https://cordioea.net/locally-managed-marine-areas/>)


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/30

Average Total Score: 20.5/30

Performance of Eol 106 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There are some proposed initiatives in terms of capacity building and communities' organization.

Evidence B: Very well aligned approach, consistent with existing efforts, with a focus on securing fisheries rights and protecting the fisheries area

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The document is confusing and the activities and results are not convincing.

Evidence B: Clearly articulated and cohesive approach, with an integrated approach to monitoring, capacity, governance

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There is some interesting elements of capacity building in para-legal terms.

Evidence B: These activities are well aligned with tackling existing threats

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: This set of activities is ambitious but achievable

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Multiple and significant sources cited, including Rare, SGP, USAID and many others

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The total area is > 1,000, 000 ha

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Well justified, although indicators missing

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The justification is clear for long-term sustainability

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: National priorities does not seem clearly stated regarding IPLC role in nature conservation.

Evidence B: Weakly justified, which is unfortunate. Mozambique is updating its 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Strong case for gender mainstreaming, and well articulated.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: There is some interesting elements of capacity building in para-legal terms.

Evidence B: This has the strong potential to be scaled up along the coast.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 15/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 35/40

Average Total Score: 25/40

Performance of Eol 106 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The proposal seem to come from local communities' organizations.

Evidence B: A partnership is proposed.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: There seems to be a network of grassroots organizations, but the point is related to the lack of clarity on how the proposed activities would face the nature conservation threats.

Evidence B: Very strong history working with major partners.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: See above.

Evidence B: Very strong partnerships in place with a range of partners.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: There seems to be projects managed by the proposing local communities' organization and the sister organizations part of the network.

Evidence B: They only lack GEF experience.

E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the EoI demonstrate project & financial management capacity needed for scale of proposed effort?

Scoring:

- Very limited (no criteria met);
- Some capacity but would require support (1/3 criteria);

- Moderate capacity (2/3 criteria met);
- Very strong (all criteria met) with demonstrated past performance

Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: They meet all 3 criteria.

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: NA

Evidence B: Yes, but poor justification

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 106 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

