

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 110

Organization: Coastal & Marine Resource Development (COMRED)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Jamison, Ervin	110	Coastal East Africa	Kenya	17	26	22	65
Edmund Barrow	110	Coastal East Africa	Kenya	19	24	23	66

Performance of Eol 110 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score



Section 1 - Experience & strengths relevant to the proposed Indigenous territory, landscape/seascape (Total Points: 30)

A) Importance of the landscape/seascape/indigenous territory for biodiversity, with additional consideration to climate benefits.

1. Is the proposed territory/landscape/seascape a globally important area for biodiversity?

Scoring:

- Not significant;
- Low Significance;
- Moderate Significance;
- Medium-high Significance;
- High Significance;
- Exceptional Significance

Reviewer A: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: Part of Global 200 marine ecoregions; 11,000+ species

Evidence B: Very important coral reef and mangrove area that is important for Biodiversity conservation and as a livelihood asset. But will be key that the BMUs and rural people are central to any lasting solution - key to this is supporting community conserved areas which include no-go areas - this seemed to work in the past (20 years ago). Communities need secure rights and responsibilities and be able to defend those rights. Many of the challenges for conservation are external to the local people (dynamiters, illegal mangrove felling and so forth). Not sure to what extent JCMAs are respected even if they exist - here there might be good plans - but the governance structures need to be in place to implement such plans. I am assuming that any Protected areas (new or extension) will be ICCAs that are formally respected (perhaps through BMUs. There is a big opportunity for real participatory (BMU, Village) land/water use planning - which can be done spatially - this would also agree on formal rights and resps

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

- >50 t/ha - Low;
- 50 - 100 t/ha - Moderate;
- >100 t/ha - High

Reviewer A: NA/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Relatively low

Evidence B: not clear - but there could be C2 restoration in mangrove restoration (community based), as well as reef restoration and for the dry coastal forests

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: 2/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: The proposal is unclear - it references specific marginalized groups, does not clearly specify

Evidence B: Not really clear - yes there are indigenous and local peoples who are the main group along this part of the coast. in terms of fishery management rights - it needs to move from "buy in from local communities" to own of secure rights (to sustainably use and management) and responsibilities (for management - including sanction). the BMUs can be a building block for management - and role of Fisheries should be more advisory, and policy support and sanction of last resort and not really as co-managers. BMUs can be classified as IPLC - but care needed so not dominated by vocal few.

4. Does the proposal explain the unique cultural significance of the area to IPLCs?

Scoring:

- No explanation given of unique significance to IPLCs;
- Significance of site(s) vaguely described;
- Unique significance of project site(s) clearly explained

Reviewer A: 1/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: References general nature-based livelihoods

Evidence B: Yes - mostly - though it could do more on role of Indigenous management institutions for land and water use - e.g role of Kayas and their institutions, traditional rules/institutions - as this is key for future sustainable and improved management by local people

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Threats are largely generic and not well defined (invasive species, pollution, climate change)

Evidence B: generally well identified - but does not do enough as to the cause of these threats - it appears that local people are the cause! - but There are other external causes - dynamite fishing (powerful people from Tanga, Dar as well as Ke); mangrove destruction for building industry (coast, Arabian Gulf) and so on. So threats need to be understood from local perspective and external (to the area) and then how will the external threats be addressed (as this is often more difficult as it deals with power where communities may not be powerful enough to sort out such external threats)

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There is reference to existing co-management plans, integrated management plans, etc.

Evidence B: Policy for community based management (forests, land, fisheries) are there - but implementation is lacking - and this is a characteristic of Kenya - good policy poor implementation. therefore the project will need to have a strong "implement policy" effort to engage decision makers (esp County gov, but also Fisheries and Forestry)

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Active co-management plans in place

Evidence B: Not clear on role of county and national government - much of the work seems to be through. This project should be firmly embedded in the CIDP and linked to at least Fisheries and Forestry Authorities at county level. This will also help make sure that there is a balance of focus between BD conservation, community based management, and livelihood improvement and security. I don't see Kenya Forest Service involvement either at county or national level

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Numerous examples cited

Evidence B: There are a number of existing and recent - mainly NGO projects; in the Past KWS had community conservation projects - for the Marine PA and the mangrove management. Much can be learnt from these projects - as a means to both conserve and secure livelihoods

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: Numerous examples

Evidence B: There are a number of projects which are aligned, but not clear as to how synergy is achieved. One role this project can take is to really bring different projects together to inform and influence at county and national levels


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 17/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 18/30

Performance of Eol 110 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 1)



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

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

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

Scoring:

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

Reviewer A: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Well-aligned but unremarkable, focusing on capacities, training

Evidence B: It is well aligned but might be over ambitious, and will be important to achieve balance between IPLC and BD conservation. Too much on BD might achieve environmental benefits at the expense of local and indigenous peoples security and livelihood improvement

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

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Lacking an overall theory of change and cohesion, and linkage to threats

Evidence B: I think the outcomes and activities are probably too ambitious. Key for me - is BMU or village based land/sea management plans which specify rights, responsibilities and benefits. these can then be brought together as one larger Shimoni-Vanga Co Man plan - but important for real ownership that it starts at village level - which is the IPLC type level - such plans must be locally owned

Outcome 3 is means to end - so put capacity building into O1. in terms of the outcomes great clarity and logic could be developed about what will actually be the result - for example a). BMU land use plans developed and implement for all BMUs; b). XX Ha of forest restored as part of plans etc.

Too much process not enough what the process will result in

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: The contributions are poorly linked

Evidence B: All the outcomes are important (except that O3 should be merged with O1) - but really need to focus on what will be achieved, how it will benefit IPLCs and environment benefits. Work on the proposal along such lines would strengthen it greatly

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Activities are well-aligned, and reasonable given the timeline and budget.

Evidence B: Broadly well aligned but need to take above comments into consideration. Focus on What will actually be done; and what it will take to do that - e.g. BMU land/sea plan implemented - requires it to be developed, ensure it embraces all stakeholders, have means to implement the plan

Such focus will help balance the level of ambition into what is achievable

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

Scoring:

- None;

- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Blue Ventures, BMU and numerous others

Evidence B: would be higher if county government projects and action were included

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: About 150K ha

Evidence B: This could be higher - as indicator 1 seen as N/A where there are probably large areas of potential ICCA (Kayas, community managed mangroves. Also land restored could include (through natural regeneration) coastal dry forest as well as mangroves

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: Clear goals, very well defined indicators

*Evidence B:*As they exist, they align - but in proposal development I would go for fewer stronger indicators - for example Mangroves restored; fishing effort reduced;

8. Does the EoI provide a clear and robust vision for long-term sustainability?

Scoring:

- Vision for long-term sustainability not provided;
- This project does not seem to have a clear long-term impact;
- This project will create medium-term benefits for biodiversity and IPLC governance, which future funding will hopefully build upon;
- This project will ensure long-term benefits to biodiversity and IPLC systems of governance

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

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There is a lengthy description, but it is not compelling

*Evidence B:*There is long term vision and sustainability but could be made much stronger - if we are building capacity for BMUs to plan (land/sea use plans), implement, monitor and learn and then do more planning

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:* 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Very well articulated

*Evidence B:*Could be stronger and provide some idea of anticipated C2 benefits. BUT C2 should really be a co-benefit to the benefits of mangrove/forest/coral restoration and the livelihood and environmental benefits

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Modest mainstreaming efforts (e.g., trainings aimed at women)

Evidence B: Moderate to good - and one key area to engage women will be in Village/BMU land/sea planning and action - and ensure women and men's activities are equally important and respected. Important that women are part of such local level governance structure (and not just the token lady-member)

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Not entirely convincing

Evidence B: Taking a focus on BMU (village) and BMUs develop and implement their plans (and indeed monitor and learn from them) - this has tremendous potential for upscaling (rest of Kenya coast for ex)


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/40

Average Total Score: 25/40

Performance of Eol 110 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 2)



Section 3 - Qualifications and experience of the Organization (Total Points: 30)

A) Indigenous Peoples or Local Community organization legally recognized under national laws.

1. Is the EoI led by an IPLC organization?

Scoring:

- IPLC appear to be beneficiaries only;
- Combination/partnership of IPLC organizations and NGOs, and plans to build IPLC capacity over the project term are clear;
- IPLC-led approach, NGOs in more limited, defined roles (such as fiduciary);
- Fully IPLC composed and led approach

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

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Beneficiary only

Evidence B: Clearly IPLC led, but also has NGOs - would do well to also embrace county government. Will need someone experienced in participatory BMU/Village land/water management

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: Numerous examples of experience and impact

Evidence B: NA

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Wide range of partners identified

Evidence B: Focus on all the BMUs critical for long term sustainability and capacity building

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: Has all elements, very experienced

Evidence B: Not sure on what type of GEF besides SGP

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: they have implemented large grants of 400K through GEF-Small Grants Program

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: with a GEF project

Evidence B: Assume that by implementing GEF projects, it has to use GEF safeguards

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 110 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

