

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 232

Organization: LEKURRUKI CONSERVATION TRUST

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
NAOMI KIPURI	232	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	16	19	14	49
David Wilkie	232	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	18	15	22	55
John Watkin	232	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	12	20	17	49

Performance of Eol 232 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: 2/5 Reviewer C: 2/5

Average: 2.33/5

Evidence A: The area houses a dry land forest surrounded by dry land ecosystem. Although it is community managed, it is also a government conservation area under Kenya Forest Service management. This means that government employed foresters are not under the jurisdiction of the community.

Evidence B: Degraded rangelands in Laikipia that still provide useful wildlife habitat

Evidence C: The EOI details the biodiversity importance of the Mukogodo National Reserve, that is a vital dry-land forest in northern Laikipia, providing vital watershed services for the headwaters of the rivers in the area.

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 Reviewer C: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Not much is mentioned in terms of carbon sequestration. The forest is however significant as a water tower for the surrounding territory.

Evidence B: No but this is likely based on forest carbon and not soil carbon

Evidence C: Typically carbon storage for such areas is $\leq 150 \text{ CtHa}$ as a dryland forest.

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 4/5 Reviewer C: NA/2

Average: 2.67/5

Evidence A: The area is partially managed under the IPLC. The conservation area draws a lot from the indigenous system of governance. However, the overall authority for its sustainability largely depends on the politics controlled by the government.

Evidence B: Area managed by a CFA that is formally recognized under Kenyan law

Evidence C: The EOI details the joint management of the area under the new Kenyan constitution.

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: NA/2 Reviewer C: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: It does to some extent but it does not show how this significance is utilized by the government in the overall conservation of the area and its ecosystem.

Evidence B: Not what so ever. Talks about biodiversity

Evidence C: Again - the EOI details the importance of the area to the Samburu communities.

C) Vulnerability of the proposed IPLCs as well as their lands/waters/natural resources to threats.

5. Is the area vulnerable to threats/current risk of negative impacts to IPLC and biodiversity without action?

Scoring:

- No evident threats;
- Low threats;
- Moderate threats;
- Medium-high threats;
- High threats;
- Requires urgent action

Reviewer A: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5 Reviewer C: 2/5

Average: 2.33/5

Evidence A: The area faces threats from logging for fuel wood and for construction; from over grazing; expansion of agriculture; forest fires; invasive plant species; over harvesting of some species for commercial use such as sandal wood; and wild animal predators and elephant destroying water sources.

Evidence B: Interestingly the community appear to recognize the land degradation is a result of community actions and choices

Evidence C: Because of the significant downturn in tourism revenue, there are very real threats to the natural resource base. Culturally, the Samburu and Pokot will strive to maintain their cattle herds as numerous as possible rather than sell these and maintain a cash reserve. As the rains in northern Kenya have been good so far this year, this will give a false sense of security.

As far as the Mukogodo Forest, there are local threats from over hunting and subsistence extraction, but the population density is relatively low at the moment. Real threats come from commercial demands and the overexploitation for timber, mineral resources and conversion to commercial agriculture.

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 Reviewer C: 3/3

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: There is legal and policy framework governing all forest reserves in the country. However, the implementation of the policies is weak. Also the management by the forest scouts is not very effective and the communities are not guaranteed access and security.

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: Yes - the community association seems well established and has put in place relevant governance under the advice of Northern Rangeland Trust.

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 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There is government support in the management by IPLCs. but not much indigenous knowledge is utilized in forest management. There seems to be little involvement by local communities in the actual management of the forest.

Evidence B: Govt support for group ranches and trusts and conservancies - e.g., NRT. Police actively support the community law enforcement efforts

Evidence C: Yes - the devolved Kenyan constitution empowers local communities to take greater responsibility over the management of the natural resource base.

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 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2.33/3

Evidence A: The area is not far from places where success initiatives have been undertaken led by IPLC. So it is possible to draw upon their experiences.

Evidence B: NRT has been active in the area for almost 2 decades

Evidence C: Il Ngwesi has been a epitome of a community based natural resource management approach that has contributed significantly to conservation and community development. Join management of Laikipia District through the Laikipia Wildlife Forum has also been transformative in reconciling private and communal landuse.

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 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The initiatives that exist are not directly aligned to the objectives of conservation pursued by the project. One is tourism related and another one is the provision of water. Northern Rangeland Trust however provide capacity building that has a potential of providing support to the project.

Evidence B: Profit sharing arrangement with a private sector tour operator. COVID-19 has effectively shut down this income stream

Evidence C: There are several opportunities for collaboration within this and neighbouring districts

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 12/30

Average Total Score: 15.33/30

Performance of Eol 232 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 1)



Section 2 - Quality and ability of the proposed approach and interventions to achieve transformational impact that generate the global environmental benefits (Total Points: 40)

A) Quality of proposed approach and ability to support traditional structures, knowledge and community practices in the delivery of global environmental benefits.

1. Is the proposed approach well aligned with the overall objective of the ICI to: Enhance Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities' (IPLCs) efforts to steward land, waters and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits?

Scoring:

- Weakly aligned;
- Partially aligned;
- Well aligned;
- Exceptionally well aligned

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

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: The EOI has a lot of potential government protected and forest and wildlife scouts have little appreciation of the IPLC contribution to the management of the forest.. The objectives of the two may be similar but they are not well aligned. If there were there would be possibility of them delivering global environmental benefits.

Evidence B: Basically this is funding to keep the conservancy going when tourism revenue has collapsed because of the pandemic

Evidence C: There is a sound institutional arrangement for the community management of this project

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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 3.33/6

Evidence A: There are sections of this EOI that are not very clear. There is also a lack of cohesion among the different sections.

Evidence B: Activities and desired outcomes only vaguely described in section 8

Evidence C: The EOI does the best it can in explaining the needs, but there needs to be a greater level of detail as to the "How" it will be achieved.

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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: Although the IPLC own the conservancy, there seems to be little contribution from partnership with government for complementarity between the conservancy and the forest to be realized.

Evidence B: As the activities and outcomes are vague it is difficult to score this. But they have staff and support from NRT

Evidence C: The review's scale is inappropriate for the question. This proposal seems well considered, but I cannot reflect this in the score.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: The range of investment proposed could be realized if they are better focused.

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: This is a well argued application and deserving of support to maintain community engagement in biodiversity conservation.

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

Scoring:

- None;

- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 1/3 Reviewer B: NA/3 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: There is minimal co-financing, however tourism activities generate income for the conservancy. Oklahoma Zoo provided support for the construction of the Headquarters for the conservancy.

Evidence B: No as \$ for the conservancy are largely derived from ecotourism

Evidence C: As far as I can tell there is some in-kind contributions.

B) Potential of the proposed activities to achieve IPLC-led transformational impact that generate global environmental benefits.

6. Are the estimated Global Environmental Benefits (GEF core indicators) substantial and realistic?

Scoring:

- Not provided;
- Very Low (below 10,000 Ha);
- Moderate (between 100,000 - 500,000 Ha);
- High (between 500,000 - 1,000,000 Ha);
- Very high above 1,000,000 Ha

Reviewer A: 1/5 Reviewer B: 2/5 Reviewer C: 2/5

Average: 1.67/5

Evidence A: Lekurruki has a total of 8,364 hectares under conservation management. For this reason, the global environmental benefits are minimal.

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: Mukogodo Forest is a vital habitat in the Laikipia landscape with significant environmental and ecosystem services.

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: NA/3 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: The indicators of this EOI are not aligned with the objectives. Some of them seem to be misplaced.

Evidence B: See table Q11

Evidence C: Yes, this application plays directly into the traditional cultural and land use by the Samburu and Pokot communities.

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 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The EOI has a potential to achieve long term sustainability and future funding might be able to build upon. But the proposed project needs to be thought through with the help of some successful neighbouring initiatives with similar objectives.

Evidence B: Yes assuming tourists return to Kenya

Evidence C: Yes - but this long-term vision is severely compromised by the downturn in tourism and there has been little planning for the impact and duration of a Covid-19 pandemic-like situation.

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: NA/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The EOI does not indicate it although by partnering with national environmental agencies and other international agencies, reflects some understanding that could be built upon.

Evidence B: NA

*Evidence C:*Through the mentorship of the NRT, this group is well placed to fulfil some of the requirement of the NBSAPs at the local scale.

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 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: One third of the personnel of the EOI are female. This is in line with the requirements as outlines by the 2010 Kenya Constitution. Both genders are also visible in different management levels of the EOI.

*Evidence B:*Some thinking but definitely a ways to go

*Evidence C:*Yes - 1/3 of the executive committee are women.

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: NA/5 Reviewer C: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: There is potential and mention of realizable results but there is no coordination between them. It is possible that realigning objectives and indicators would produce the required results.

*Evidence B:*No this is classic conservancy work - effective but not innovative

*Evidence C:*Investing in such a group at this time of need will reap many benefits.

Section 2:


Reviewer A Total Score: 19/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 15/40

Reviewer C Total Score: 20/40

Average Total Score: 18/40

Performance of Eol 232 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: 6/6 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 4.67/6

Evidence A: The Conservancy is owned by the IPLC but they partner with national NGOs. Some national/state agencies including forest and wildlife agencies play significant roles in the conservancy.

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: LCT is a sound entity for the landscape in which they are located.

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 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: On the ground, yes the proposed project is led and run by IPLC which is relevant for the proposed work. The capacity of the IPLC may not be at the required standard, but it has potential for improvement.

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: LCT is a sound entity for the landscape in which they are located.

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: 4/5 Reviewer C: 2/5

Average: 2.67/5

Evidence A: The EOI is run by IPLC, and it has a local Trust as a partner. There are also other similar IPLC in the neighboring area which who could have helped in project design and governance.

Evidence B: See table Q20

Evidence C: They are a strong local partner in achieving conservation on the ground.

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: 4/5 Reviewer C: 2/5

Average: 2.67/5

Evidence A: The activities as outlines seem to be realizable but they are not aligned with the indicators and desired results. This leaves some gaps in comprehending the direction of the proposed project.

Evidence B: Not explicitly described but have managed other \$400K grants

Evidence C: It's a chicken and an egg situation. If awarded this grant, LCT can look to recruit consultants and staff to fill the gaps in their capacity.

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: 4/6 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 3.33/6

Evidence A: Some aspects of the proposed project are good and the fact the it is run by IPLC is commendable. However it is clear that the capacity is lacking the leadership of the project to connect the various elements of what is required in project design and management.

Evidence B: Assumed Yes as managed other grants. But they left Q19 blank

Evidence C: I believe that they are as robust as can be expected.

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 Reviewer C: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: The EOI does not mention any safeguards so it is possible that they are unaware of them or unaware of them to be mentioned here.

Evidence B: No

Evidence C: They will have relevant support on this front from NRT.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 14/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 17/30

Average Total Score: 17.67/30

Performance of Eol 232 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

