

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 328

Organization: LELEWAL FOUNDATION

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Edmund Barrow	328	Congo Basin	Cameroon	20	22	16	58
Olivier Langrand	328	Congo Basin	Cameroon	26	17	15	58

Performance of Eol 328 in Congo Basin - 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: 5/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Important BD, congo forest, but a lot of questionable logging

*Evidence B:* The area of Dja National Park is of exceptional importance as far as biodiversity is concerned. In addition this area forms with two other major protected areas (Minkebe in Gabon and Odzala in Congo) the TRIDOM which is a major transborder conservation initiative.

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:* the whole area is important for above ground C2 (probably not much below ground), but a lot of that being removed by industrial logging

*Evidence B:* The area around Dja National Park has a high carbon value as it is the case of all the forest blocks included in the TRIDOM.

### 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: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* Cameroon policy/law not at all good on rights of IPLCs to their areas of land - as State sees such lands as unoccupied and so belong to the state - irrespective of presence of IPs. Customary forest governance not respected so IPLCs do not have tenure security. Therefore can this project change anything in terms of security and rights??

*Evidence B:* The legislation in Cameroon allows management of natural resources and land by IPLC and Djoum, the area under consideration, has benefited from it. IP (Baka and Kaka) and LC (Fang, Bulu) groups are included in the governance system.

**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:* and the fact that IPs are ignored though local people have rights

*Evidence B:* In different sections of the proposal the proponent describes clearly the cultural significance of the area for IPLC and in particular for the Baka.

**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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5*

### **Average: 5/5**

*Evidence A:* Rights of IPs in Cameroon require urgent actions and maybe IPLC work (with both IPs and Local peoples) might be the way to go. Cameroon does not respect IP rights, despite rhetoric to the contrary

*Evidence B:* The biodiversity of the area is under high pressure as a result of the degradation and the fragmentation of the forest through legal and illegal commercial logging, illicit bushmeat trade and agriculture expansion. The IPLC present in the area are suffering from the lack of governance applied to natural resources which jeopardize their ability to maintain traditional way of living.

## 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: 3/3*

### **Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Decentralized forest management might better respect IP rights but the key will be ownership of land and IPLC governance - both of which I am not sure about. As state might withdraw Local forest management rights if the IPLCs do not adhere to the (detailed) plans they have to have

*Evidence B:* In theory the national legislation in Cameroon promotes the co-management of the land and the natural resources with IPLC. The legal framework exists but the poor governance makes the implementation of the legislation not effective. Biodiversity continues to get eroded at a high rate and IPLC are losing opportunities to manage resources sustainably and to their benefit.

### 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:* Seems to be some support for IPLC management at local level. this will improve if IPLCs actually have secure rights to their lands through this process. therefore activities of this EoI should be seen in the context of IPLC governance of their community forests - e.g. securing rights to cultural/sacred forests, agroforestry, and possibly agriculture and apiculture

*Evidence B:* The area of Djoum is a prime target for the implementation of IPLC-led conservation. NBSAP II of Cameroon is promoting decentralization of the management of the resources and the conservation of biodiversity through activities developed by IPLC.

## 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:* Still newish in Cameroon and fraught with challenges as powerful and the timber lobby do not really want community forest management

*Evidence B:* There are a number of IPLC-led initiatives focusing on agroforestry, bee-keeping and advocacy. However, not IPLC-led biodiversity conservation initiatives are described.

## 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:* 1/3

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* Mostly locally funded (Djoum council) which is good - but most relate to usual rural development shopping list of activities - agriculture, bees, agroforestry, poultry and so forth - not really on secure governance

*Evidence B:* The IPLC-led initiatives in the region are not biodiversity conservation focused but more rural development by and to the benefit of IPLC.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 328 in Congo Basin - 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:* My worry is that most of the activities relate to rural development activities which do not have a context the securing overall IPLC governance. Inclusive conservation not really clear on what they will actually do beyond words. This EoI would do well to have larger outcomes or KRAs and then have SMART activities - that would then show how activities such as poultry contribute to outcomes

*Evidence B:* The proposed project is very much focusing on improving the well-being of IPLC through rural development and advocacy on land tenure. However, not activities dedicated to the conservation or the sustainable management of forest products are proposed.

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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* As for Q1 above - ToC not clear, activities and Outcomes not SMART. Expected results would do better to be framed in terms of indicators (e.g. IPLC governance structures in place, representative and approved for 5 Community Forest Areas)

*Evidence B:* The proposed activities are unlikely to address, even partially, the issue of the erosion of biodiversity in the region of Djoum that is impacting economically, socially and culturally IPLC.

### 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: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Just by improving livelihoods (honey, poultry, agric) does not necessarily lead to improved conservation outcomes. There has to be linkages and cause-effect

*Evidence B:* The dimension of conservation or sustainable management of the forest of the Djoum area is not taken into account in the objectives and activities proposed by Lelewal.

### 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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

**Average: 1/3**

*Evidence A:* Only 2 REDD related projects - does not give a clear picture of overall activity contributions

*Evidence B:* The proposed project is a rural development project by and for IPLC. It would have been good for the proponent to relate these activities to the objective of conservation and sustainable management of natural resources that are indispensable to IPLC to maintain their traditional way of life.

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

#### Scoring:

- None;
- Small;



- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* But it all seems to be coming from Djoum Council which is a bit risky

*Evidence B:* There are some suggestions of co-funding sources, including one which is a percentage of the revenue of logging going to IPLC which appears as a perverse and dangerous incentive for IPLC.

**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:* But I cant see why Oil Palm plantation should be included!! GEF 7 Core indicator - I do not yet see the links between the proposed geography and the activities of the project

*Evidence B:* The area covered by the project reached over 540,000 ha of which 90% is made of logging concessions which are described as not run according to the terms agreed as far as the numbers of logs per species extracted and the needed restoration activities are concerned.

**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: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Sacred Groves, culturally important areas which are an important component and there are activities to support this - but again it needs to be seen as part of the bigger conservation picture

*Evidence B:* The additional cultural results are not really aligned with the project objectives which do not include elements of conservation or management of the forest resources.

## 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:* 1/3

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The vision for future and sustainability - needs to be sharper and clearer - this should be the vision of the project - and what the outcomes will contribute to

*Evidence B:* Considering that the issue of the conservation or the management of the forest of the Djoum area is not addressed in the proposal the project cannot have a long-term sustainability vision.

## 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:* Agroforestry, restoration at community level and esp with IPLCs will contribute

*Evidence B:* The contribution of the project to NBSAP II of Cameroon is restricted to the improvement of livelihood of IPLC through the development of rural development activities but does not address the need for the management of the natural resources that IPLC depend on for maintaining their traditional way of life.

## 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:* I don't get a clear picture of what will happen! will gender roles be better understood and respected? will women have clear governance roles?

*Evidence B:* The proposal describes clearly gender in the different activities planned. Who will undertake the activities and who will be the beneficiaries is well presented.

### 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: 1/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* This project could be really important for IPLC led community forest activities in other part of Cameroon but learning will be an important element - esp at Council and IPLC levels - and not just a part of M&E

*Evidence B:* There is very limited innovation in the proposal and its potential for transformative results very limited.


## Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 17/40

**Average Total Score: 19.5/40**

Performance of Eol 328 in Congo Basin - 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 3/6**

*Evidence A:* IPLC both IP and Local people are the main beneficiaries. Lelewal seem to be an IPLC organization - though again not clear

*Evidence B:* Four IPLC groups are described as partners of Lelewal in the proposal.

### 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:* Missing skills - governance (representation, accountability etc.)

*Evidence B:* Lelewal and two other NGOs described as partners in the proposal have demonstrated leadership in Djoum.

### 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

### **Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* Good number of local partners and also important links with Council - which is v.g. - as this is one of the few Eol I have reviewed that has concrete links with government

*Evidence B:* The four IPLC partners have a clear assigned role in the implementation of activities. Their role in decision-making and in the governance of the project is not defined. However, Lelewall has the experience in leading IPLC groups and has a strong knowledge of the area of Djoum.

## 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

### **Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* No GEF or other multi-lateral; but a good range of other required skills

*Evidence B:* The Eol is pretty clear as far as who is doing what and who is benefiting from what. The roles of the lead organization, the two partner NGOs and the four IPLC groups are defined.

## E) Project Management capacity.

5. Does the Eol 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A:* It looks as though they are used to having projects funded by Council - which is great, but may not be enough. Although I think they have received some UN funding - but it does not seem to be direct funding

*Evidence B:* Lelewal has experience managing project up to \$200,000 but has no experience managing funding from a major public donor.

## 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:* No GEF and I dont think has implemented safeguards for other organizations

*Evidence B:* No GEF experience or safeguards experience.

### Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 15/30*

**Average Total Score: 15.5/30**

Performance of Eol 328 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

