

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 327

Organization: Indigenous Movement for Peace Advancement N/A& Conflict Transformation (IMPACT)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Agnes Leina	327	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	22	32	24	78
NAOMI KIPURI	327	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	30	39	30	99

Performance of Eol 327 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: It contains 92% of dry lands ecosystem and hundreds and hundreds of mammal, bird, amphibians and reptile species and ecological value to capture a significant amount of CO2 to support climate mitigation and adaptation.

Evidence B: The area this EOI covers is vast and cuts across seven political counties across Kenya and a number of ecological zones, It is a river basin dubbed a 'cradle of biological and cultural diversity. It has been managed by different indigenous pastoralist communities for centuries and its preservation is critical for the sustainability of their livelihoods.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: It covers 47,655km square

Evidence B: Yes. Very. The basin contains significant levels of biodiversity and has ample ecological value including the potential to capture significant amounts of CO2 to support climate mitigation and adaptation. It also aims at restoring degraded range lands and in so doing improve soil carbon storage.

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: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: It started off with very strong cultural and traditional leadership and then weakened gradually through colonialists settled in the laikipia plateau and to date they occupy a larger chunk of land and territories in this region

Evidence B: The basin is utilized by different pastoralist communities drawing upon their indigenous cultural knowledge of resource management to sustain the area as well as their livelihoods. The knowledge is ancient dating back to 1600 BC and it is a highly specialized form of transhumance which allows strategic mobility of herds to achieve sustainable utilization of spatial resources given precarious climatic conditions.

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: So much of the time was spent in explaining traditional leadership system in question 2 but the unique cultural significance is explained in in Q4. Communities as custodians of Biodiversity and sacred sites

Evidence B: The uniqueness of the basin is properly articulated in the EOI. It clearly relates the intricate manner in which cultural knowledge is drawn upon for the utilization and management of spatial resources for long term sustainability. It shows a clear understanding of the significance of the basin as a globally unique and important facility.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The threats are high including the lose of land and land cover change, over exploitation of natural resources, investments in high infrastructure like LAPSET, cultural erosion among other threats have been cited

Evidence B: Since the basin cuts across a number of political regions, its management requires action from many stakeholders some of whom do not necessarily appreciate the uniqueness of the whole basin. It is urgent that the importance of the area as well as the planned action be shared by all users. This is likely to reduce potential and real threats to the facility.

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: The regulations and policies are there but lack implementing regulations

Evidence B: Yes. The legislative and policy framework has been gradually changing over the past two decades in favour of a return to traditional ways of utilizing resources in dry lands. The national policy on arid and semi arid regions as well as the 2010 constitution of Kenya have both lend support to customary management of resources including mobile pastoralism.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The regulations and policies that support IPLC-led conservation are many but no implementation

Evidence B: National government have demonstrated support to customary land management systems through the enactment of the 2010 Kenya constitution. Community Land Act was also passed in 2016 also provides the necessary legal framework. Similarly, some of the county governments such as Samburu county is also considering institutionalizing this IPLC led conservation system in their draft range land policy. It is also apparent that other partners are all on board to promote ideas expressed therein.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Certainly very relevant IPLC led conservation projects have been established very well

Evidence B: There are some examples of ICCAs in Kenya that have received national and international recognition that could provide foundation for scaling up. The sacred Kaya forest groves of the coastal zone are one such example. They have been recognised for their cultural and biological protected under the Antiquities Act as National Monuments. At the same time Marine Parks and coral reefs in the same region have also received recognition such that defined groups of users have been granted rights to establish 'Locally Managed Marine Areas' (LMMA) to co-manage and conserve marine resources.

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: There is consistency in the alignment of projects goals

*Evidence B:*IMPACT have partnered with Wetlands International and PfR that work in the same area on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) at Ewaso Ng'iro River Basin . This work has focused on improved management of ecosystems and associated resources as a basis for resilient indigenous communities and landscapes. There are also a number of other complementary activities in the same area.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30

Average Total Score: 26/30

Performance of Eol 327 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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Its very well and clearly outlined

Evidence B: It is well aligned since it focuses on utilizing indigenous governance systems of environmental management -such as elders, age-set leaders and spiritual leaders to play the role of community legislative mechanisms to advise on the use of natural resources for the area. This establishes a regulatory framework for the management of water and range resources for livestock. The EOI aims at strengthening these systems for long term sustainability and deliver global environmental benefits.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: This is very well presented and quite convincing and achievable

Evidence B: The objective for this EOI are very clearly indicated and are cohesive with the activities and time frame.

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: Very clear and realistic and achievable

Evidence B: The EOI is led by indigenous people and have clear ideas on how planned activities and objectives will address identified threats. The plans are quite ambitious but they are also realistic.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: activities are well aligned with with Eol

Evidence B: The organization has had many years of experience in similar projects and the activities /results are exceptionally well aligned with EOI range of investment.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Several sources of Co-financing named

Evidence B: The EOI has indicated many partners and the range of support they provide. Some of them have been supporting the organization for a long time.

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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Its estimated at 4,480,488Ha very high above 1,000,000Ha

Evidence B: Substantial amounts of funding have been received before by this EOI. It has a high potential of realizing desired results.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: moderately aligned to project goals

Evidence B: The EOI has drawn very appropriate cultural and livelihood indicators derived from project goals, All gender and age categories play culturally appropriate roles to realize project objectives,

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: certainly there will be a medium term sustainability which future funding will hopefully build on

Evidence B: Yes. The EOI has clearly indicated how its objectives will realize long term biodiversity benefits utilizing IPLC governance system.

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: citation of several international instruments such as UNCCC, CBD, NBSAP among many, demonstrated knowledge and experience in these instruments

Evidence B: The EOI is fully aware of all relevant county and national policy and legal frameworks that have the potential of advancing environmental priorities.

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: SDG 3,5,8 are mentioned and activities are herein proposed, though no mention of a gender mainstreaming policy

Evidence B: The EOI is very well versed in constitutional requirements vis a vis gender and has applied them in the application.

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:* 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: it's a well thought out EOI

Evidence B: TMPACT is the most innovative of all the EOIs. It has high potential in realizing the desired objectives.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 39/40

Average Total Score: 35.5/40

Performance of Eol 327 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: Ewaso Nyiro Basin even as the name suggests is fully IPLC

Evidence B: Yes. Most significant positions are occupied by Indigenous people whose capacity are reasonably high.

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: Well leader in the region for many years

Evidence B: The EOI shows that Indigenous peoples are the ones in charge of the initiative over a long period of time,

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: This is well thought out and evident from the EoI

Evidence B: There are many partners and networks with whom the organization works. The networks are spread within the region, nationally and internationally. It works closely with other IPLC organizations.

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Full capacity though not GEF

Evidence B: The personnel of the organization have the relevant skills and long term experience in environmental management issues including 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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: moderate capacity has been demonstrated

Evidence B: The EOI meets all the required criteria and has demonstrated performance accumulated over a long time.

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: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Examples are cited of participation in the review of world bank standards and safe guards for indigenous peoples

Evidence B: The organization is well versed in all relevant safeguards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30

Average Total Score: 27/30

Performance of Eol 327 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

