

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 112

Organization: Kirimon Community Conservancy

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Susan Stone	112	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	22	20	13	55
Holly Dublin	112	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	16	15	14	45

Performance of Eol 112 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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Proposed area of interest shows a high species range and rarity. Community Conservancy area of 36KHa serves as a corridor for elephants and other wildlife.

Evidence B: The area provides range for Grevy's zebra - a globally threatened species. It is also home to a wide representation of the flora and fauna of the semi-arid and arid lands of Kenya. I am not aware of any analysis that has been done on threat or endemism of species more broadly but the area is certainly still maintained in a natural state, though increasingly degraded by over-stocking of livestock.

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: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Area shows a low to moderate level of irrecoverable carbon. Proposed project activities include reducing felling of live trees and dependence on charcoal, reducing carbon emissions.

Evidence B: The proposal does not make any comment on carbon density but as it is comprised of savanna woodlands and thickets and open grasslands, the carbon values will not likely be very high and will more likely be low to moderate. I have not seen any data on soil 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Conservancies are led by landowner committees and governed by a Board of Directors drawn from the community. The predominant group in the Eol area is the Samburu People. Per the Eol, '...the conservancy board members provide required leadership under the Samburu traditional and cultural powerful informal laws which are held in the custody of the community by elders. 'Community conservancies are now recognized by law as protected areas with strict requirements to achieve the PA status. One of these obligations is that a conservancy must demonstrate strong governance structure.

Evidence B: Much of the land that the Conservancy manages is, in fact, held under a Laikipia County National Reserve. The Conservancy is established as a CBO and that would not automatically give it governance rights over the land.

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: Eol indicated that the Samburu people are pastoralists with historical coexistence between people, livestock, and wildlife. Cultural significance is referenced and/or implied throughout the Eol, although not specifically articulated in detail.

Evidence B: The Eol speaks to the fact that the area is inhabited by the local Samburu tribe - one of Kenya's main pastoral groups, particularly inhabiting these arid rangelands of the north. While the Samburu still lead a largely traditional lifestyle many changes are taking place and rapidly. Though their traditionally nomadic ways have long ceased to exist and they are now far more sedentary, I am not aware that their ethnic identity is in any way being challenged.

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Main threats to the area include habitat loss, overexploitation, climate change and environmental pollution. Threats are interconnected, increasing intensity. Climate change impacts validity of traditional knowledge and increased extremes of drought and flooding impact all areas.

Evidence B: Climate change impacts have become very evident in the area with regular extreme weather events - moving from drought to flooding and back. The rates of human population increase remain high, with likely reductions in infant mortality and habitat destruction (describe in the EoI) is prevalent - largely for fuel and fodder. Livestock numbers fluctuate but in recent years both due to government policy and the need for fast economic turnover, the expansion of sheep and goats (and their inherent degradation of the land at high densities) is apparent.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Per the EoI, Kirimon Community Conservancy works under the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act (CAP 376) guidelines that stipulates the programs and activities that a conservancy can implement for sustainability. It is difficult to rate this question since indigenous peoples are not recognized in Kenya, which has not signed ILO 169 nor ratified UNDRIP. Community land rights are recognized per Article 63 of the Constitution of Kenya which guarantees the rights of communities to their lands and territories. It states that community land consists of land lawfully held, managed, or used by specific communities as community forests, grazing areas or shrines and that it includes ancestral lands and lands traditionally occupied by hunter-gatherer communities.

Evidence B: This is a difficult one to score. Where as the WCMA of 2013 provides for devolution of rights, there is still a painful lack of enabling regulations. The country's Ministry of Wildlife and Tourism regularly makes supportive statements about community rights to benefit from the country's natural resources but the real rights to self-determination over land and natural resources is certainly not devolved. To make matters more complicated, a sister Ministry has now proposed essentially competing legislation over the rights to natural resources (above and below ground) and this is likely to create a confused policy, legislative and regulatory environment going forward.

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: See Q. 6 above. IPLC conservation is occurring via CCAs, but not recognized as indigenous peoples conservation. Eol indicates strong partnership with the Kenya Wildlife Service to which rangers report data and with the Kenya Police Service which trains community enforcement officers.

Evidence B: As stated above, much progress has been made - especially with the establishment and recognition of the Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association, its Regional Associations and the 160+ conservancies established around the country. But most of the natural resources remain public assets and, as such, limit the rights of local communities to use and benefit from them.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The applicant Conservancy is a member of the Northern Rangeland Trust, which include 39 Community Conservancies. The NRT service as main funder and partner to the Kirimon Conservancy. KCC is also a member of the Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association which works with communities to conserve and manage wildlife outside of formally protected areas.

Evidence B: Laikipia County and the local government that came before it have long worked with the many private landowners in Laikipia to establish opportunities for communities in the area to undertake (and benefit from) conservation initiatives. While it is not quite clear to me whether this application is directly under the legal banner of NRT or the small Kirimon Community Conservancy

CBO, the area has long been receiving external donor money for conservation - over the years it must be in the hundreds of millions if not more, though these figures are not available in any summarised way to the best of my knowledge.

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: Since this is an EoI from a single Conservancy other investments are small and activities funded by the same source. The EoI mentions other Conservancies as partners, but Northern Rangelands Trust is currently the sole funder of activities.

Evidence B: Again, if this is essentially part of the "NRT Empire" then there is strong complementary support for this initiative as well.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 16/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 112 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: The approach is well aligned in that is fully designed and led by IPLC organization and it addresses threats to both biodiversity and human livelihoods. Impact and results would be significant for the proposed area, but the size of the Conservancy limits the impact to GEBs

Evidence B: The EoI focuses on some very specific activities out of a much larger range of what might be possible. It focuses on improved management of habitats and wildlife.

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: The activities will contribute to results/outcomes and are realistic in scope to address the priorities stated in the EoI. However, the activities are not clearly connected to each result. The approach appears well thought out and community priorities and planning are evident, but the approach needs to be organized into a logical flow. The Conservancy would benefit from some mentoring in project design from a more experienced local organization.

Evidence B: There is no clear and overarching ToC. The EoI reads like many proposal from early stage community groups - expressing a knowledge of some of the threats and laying out some activities that could be done if funds are made available. There almost seems to be a supposition that any prospective donor would simply understand innately why the actions proposed are of importance. I do not see, however, how the activities would add up to more than Outputs. Outcomes and Impacts would not

be clearly articulated within the vision at present. Note: the layout in the EoI of the logical framework is unclear - there seem to be Activities, Outcomes and Results - in most LF's Activities would lead to Results/Outputs, which in their totality would lead to Outcomes. So it is not straightforward what level this review is aimed at.

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: The proposed activities would all contribute to overcoming identified threats. However, the number of activities may be difficult for one community to effectively implement. A detailed action plan identifying sources of skills and would be required.

Evidence B: As climate change is probably one of the greatest threats to this area, I am not sure that interventions at this level can really claim to be mitigating CC - and there is no direct mention in the EoI of CC adaptation, which might be more attainable. There is also a description of the need for community game guards and yet presumably what they are hired to address (illegal wildlife trade and other illegal activities) do not come across as a major part of the threat analysis. Charcoal production and burning are an area of activity focus but the scale of the response remains small relative to the problems it is trying to address.

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: Activities would be a small investment and may qualify better as a sub-grant from a Conservancy Association.

Evidence B: As the Kirimon Community Conservancy seems to have been handling a budget somewhere on the scale of \$30K - 40K per year many additional pieces will probably need to be in place to even be able to handle \$500K over 5 years. It is an early stage institution with limited capacity. However, if this is seen as additional funding to NRT 's overall management inputs, I am sure the resources would be put to use, perhaps for activities assisting both Kirimon and the wider area covered by the 38 other member conservancies. I am just not convinced of the current absorptive capacity of Kirimon Community Conservancy itself.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: In kind contributions from Conservancy members are the only co-financing identified.

Evidence B: While the EoI mentions that NRT provide co-financing for their daily operations and managerial work, it never makes clear in real numbers what levels of co-financing they are in fact obtaining from NRT. The EoI presents several project budgets (all apparently financed by NRT) that come to a total of ~\$30K, though it is not clear over what time frame. As a reviewer I am not made aware of any current or potential support beyond NRT

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: This is a very small project with area under improved management shown as 36Kha.

Evidence B: The area of the Kirimon Community Conservancy in total is 36,000ha. It is stated that all 36,000 will be restored but that 10,000 of this 36,000 will be under improved practices. In other words, it is unclear whether all or only ~25% of the Conservancy will actively contribute to Global Benefits - either way it is a very small area. From a Global Benefits side it might be more important to ascertain whether it holds any critical habitat or seasonal range for the Grevy's zebra population.

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: Indicators are aligned with project goals.

Evidence B: Again, as there is no clear ToC provided it is difficult to understand the causal links. We see the rather common refrain that small enterprises will be set up for honey production and the use of local resins and gums - there is not accompanying assessment of the markets for these natural products or resources. I would say there is an implicit ToC that by improving livelihoods it will lead to better conservation but it could just as equally lead to improved livelihoods without better conservation. With the strong thrust on reducing charcoal production the project would need to find additional revenues for the purchase of solar or other more environmentally-friendly energy sources, while at the same time replacing any revenue derived through charcoal sales. However, this is a very basic proposal with a list of activities and a lot of unstated (and perhaps not yet articulated) assumptions.

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: Project would lay foundation to improve IPLC management and address threats. However, project needs to have a clear longer-term plan in a full proposal to ensure initial objectives have a clear connection to future sustainability.

Evidence B: The EoI does not make a strong case for long-term sustainability. In fact, their own statement "... this will develop a continuous chain of project activities even in future" leads one to wonder if they view donor funding as the only route they wish to follow to long term financial sustainability. And when it comes to ecological and social sustainability again the ToC is not well developed. It is clear the activities are intended to bring local environmental and social benefits but the long-term sustainability of these benefits is not well described in the EoI. I was struck, however, that no real explanation was offered for the role of livestock in their livelihoods and in the long-term sustainability of the Conservancy - clearly they need to find a balance there and the management of their stock is taken up in their comments on the need to develop grazing by-laws. What these by-laws are going to do remains only speculative on my part but I am imagining it is to allow for the persistence of their pastoral lifestyle, while ensuring that overstocking does not overwhelm the conservation values still present.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3

Average: NaN/3

Evidence A: Information not included in EoI.

Evidence B: I really do not feel that the proponents are aware of the content of Kenya's NBSAP or NDC - or even the contributions expected at the County level. The reply to this question is very, very general in nature.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Gender mainstreaming is recognized throughout the various activities proposed.

Evidence B: Attention is paid to the gender issue (specifically the greater visibility and empowerment of women) but it is also made clear that this is a very patriarchal society. Some lofty aspirations are mentioned but the route to them (e.g. getting women onto the Board and other senior governance positions) is not clear. And in talking about exchange and exposure tours involving over 80 people, no women are mentioned at all. Perhaps it is implicit but it is not clearly stated. They do mention that they rely on NRT's gender unit and intend for women to play a major role in helping their community move to better and more sustainable practices.

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: 1/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: At the community scale, yes. Potential for replicability would increase scale. Other Conservancies are identified for learning exchange.

Evidence B: I don't think what is being proposed could be considered transformative, though they might be able to scale with the help of NRT and the fact that there are 38 other conservancies (though these are not mentioned in the EoI). The EoI actually reads as a standard integrated conservation and development project, which probably does not do justice to the bigger vision of their parent organisation - NRT.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 15/40

Average Total Score: 17.5/40

Performance of Eol 112 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Fully composed by Kirimon Conservancy but would rely on umbrella association, North Rangelands Trust for fiduciary role.

Evidence B: As the Kirimon Community Conservancy is registered as a CBO, it clearly is not simply the beneficiary of NRT but the actual relationship between the two is not well defined in the EoI. In fact, it left me wondering if the proponents simply assumed that ICI would be very familiar with NRT without them having to describe anything but some of the more tangible aspects - such as financial support. At this stage it seems the Kirimon Conservancy want to lead their own future but these are obviously early days.

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: Applicant has an on the ground Conservancy Manager showing appropriate skills and experience. However, he is appears tasked with all management functions and implementation and financial oversight. EoI implies a high dependence on community members for implementation. A full proposal would need action plan with clearer definition of skills and personnel.

Evidence B: Sounds like they have a very energetic young conservancy manager - which can go a long way. But as I said above - there is still much to be done here.

C) Proven relevant experience in working with IPLC networks, alliances and organizations/ strength of partnerships on the ground.

3. Does Eol 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Only Northern Rangelands Trust is shown as a supporting partner to supplement Conservancy staff expertise.

Evidence B: This is a difficult question to reply to because I have to work from the premise that NRT is, in fact, an IPLC partner and I am not sure that can be supported. If NRT is not considered an IPLC partner, then this would be at the other end of the scale - No IPLC partner identified. I cannot make the judgement myself and ICI would need to delve into this and the manner in which they define an IPLC partner. For me NRT is something of a hybrid organisation - but not really what I would consider an IPLC.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Staff limited to Conservancy Manager who lists sufficient skills. However, he is the sole staff member for implementation and oversight, including fiduciary responsibilities. Not clear if Northern Rangelands Trust would provide fiduciary or management support. No experience with GEF projects or complexities of multilateral funding.

Evidence B: I definitely think that the Conservancy would benefit from doing more work on its theory of change as a starting point because they need to have a good look at the proposed activities to understand what they are truly trying to achieve. The activities proposed are not hugely challenging from a technical perspective but could certainly be improved with some up-skilling. This would help both the Conservancy and the probability of their achieving meaningful Outputs and even impacts.

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: 2/6 *Reviewer B:* 2/6

Average: 2/6

Evidence A: See. Q. 4 above Financial resources are not diversified-80% from one source. Annual budget is \$45K and project example indicated grant amount of \$30k.

Evidence B: The organisation claims an average annual budget of ~\$44K/year. This really creates worries for a project of this size. At present they do not meet this minimum requirement - Kirimon Community Conservancy has never had anything near \$200,000. They do seem to have good financial skills and they conduct external audits, even in this tiny CBO. Given that the manager is a financial person himself, I am sure this can be built. So if it is only NRT required to have these skills then that is different. They are well experienced in managing large projects.

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: They have answered "yes" but the question is whether it is Kirimon or NRT answering this. Kirimon has never been involved with a GEF project. I think they would need a considerable amount of work on safeguards, though they have great sensitivities to the social needs of their people.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 13/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 14/30

Average Total Score: 13.5/30

Performance of Eol 112 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

