

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 165

Organization: Kiunga Community Conservancy (KICOCO)

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Agnes Leina	165	Coastal East Africa	Kenya	13	12	5	30
Naomi Kipuri	165	Coastal East Africa	Kenya	26	34	5	65

Performance of Eol 165 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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 5/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The applicant does not have any empirical data to back the information given, either in acres or hectares so it makes it difficult to the actual marine scape and its climate benefits

*Evidence B:* The area has some very unique features such as mangroves and life forms that are endemic to it and nowhere else.

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: 2/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* Again there is mention of mangroves forest and marines but no numerical data given to appreciate the density of carbon surrounding the project

*Evidence B:* It is very delicate and needs protection.

### 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: 1/5*

**Average: 1.5/5**

*Evidence A:* There is mention of the Bajuni IPs but the CBO is managed by a board of management and there is no mention of IPLC traditional governance system or leadership

*Evidence B:* The conservancy is managed by local Bajuni cocommunity of fisher people. They fit the category of Local Community.

#### 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: NA/2 Reviewer B: 2/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* No cultural significance is explained

*Evidence B:* The project adequately explains the uniqueness of the marine life forms and , mangrove swamp and corral reef.

#### 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: 5/5*

## Average: 4/5

*Evidence A:* There are so many threats explained, the over fishing, the marine trash, the over logging of mangrooves, among others. The only problem in the whole EoI is lack of evidence and numerical data, so the extent of the threat is not known

*Evidence B:* Some of the threat include over fishing and unsustainable fishing practices, pollution with plastics and other waste., illegal logging and poaching, and many other 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3*

## Average: 2.5/3

*Evidence A:* Kenya is known for so many acts and laws and policies in place , the only problem is lack of implementing regulations

*Evidence B:* The county and national legal and policy framework are referred to the extend in which it supports local community's contribution to conservation processes.

#### 7. Is there active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed country/area?

*Scoring:*

- National or sub-national governments are actively opposed to IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have recognized the importance of IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments are actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation

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

## Average: 2.5/3

*Evidence A:* The applicant recognises for instance the engagement of KWS has been supportive, then the implementation of wildlife-marine -conservancy management monitoring system has attracted government support

*Evidence B:* Both county and national government support the initiative.

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 mangrove restoration program need upscaling, the Ocean trash and and plastic recycling needs upscaling. Again the only problem is the extent of the scaling up which is not estimated at all

*Evidence B:*Conservation idea is now popular in all parts of the country.

#### 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: NA/2 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* Only 3 on going activities are mentioned, plastic collection competition, capacity building of BMU and sustainable fisheries management, all are supported by NRT, TNC, and Arcadia. This is not much

*Evidence B:*The conservancy is a member of the Northern Rangelands Trust which brings in examples of other initiatives.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 13/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 19.5/30

Performance of Eol 165 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The mention of constructing a plastic collection centre is welcome owing to the high rate of marine trash and litter but that is about all, the other activities are about capacity building and the outcome could be shallow not very strong and not backed by empirical data

*Evidence B:* To the extent in which it is focused on local communities.

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: 6/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* As mentioned above the activities are not strong and convincing. There are only 3 activities.

*Evidence B:* Quite clear and straight forward.

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: 3/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The contribution to address the threats is quit low. Planting only 9 thousand mangroves is low, increasing only 5000 litres of water is low

*Evidence B:*In as much as reference is to local communities, they are simple and easy to implement.

#### 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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The applicant did not provide budget examples of similar projects implemented in the past

*Evidence B:*They are although less amounts were expended previously.

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* NRAT, TNC, Safari Doctors, KWS, County Government and local community are all mentioned as playing the role of offering technical support, no co-financing and amount of financing support is mentioned in the Eol



*Evidence B:* It indicates quite a number of partners without indicating the amount of financing they bring in. But perhaps they bring in expertise and capacity building.

**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: 4/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* It is precisely a total of app. 72,000 ha.

*Evidence B:* High but not too high.

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: NA/3 Reviewer B: NA/3*

**Average: NaN/3**

*Evidence A:* Question answered out of context

*Evidence B:* Although Bajuni are fishing community, there is not indication as to how their culture and fishing strategies could be harnessed for the sustainability of the ecosystem.

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: 2/3*

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

*Evidence A:* There is some income generating activities that will be of help for sustainability till the next funding is available

*Evidence B:* There is an indication that some objectives can be achieved within a relatively short time which others can be carried out by local communities in conjunction with the line departments of the county government.

## 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: 3/3*

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

*Evidence A:* The applicant did not provide the contributions

*Evidence B:* These are well articulated.

## 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:* The micro enterprise project and plastic collection projects belong to women no mention of youth and disability

*Evidence B:* It indicates that it has prioritized women empowerment and increased their participation in conservation programs.

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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 5/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* From the beginning, very little has been demonstrated for large scale and no maps or numerical data is shown throughout the EoI

*Evidence B:* It does demonstrate high potential.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 12/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 34/40

Average Total Score: 23/40

Performance of Eol 165 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: NA/6*

**Average: NaN/6**

*Evidence A:* There is no mention of the IPLCs here at all, its very clear they are only beneficiaries

*Evidence B:* Marine zones are delicate and they suffer from many threats that are bound to destroy them completely. The Bajuni, a cross between Arab and local Giriama people are fisher folk who for generations have acted as custodians of the marine resources discussed. The project needs to be supported for future generation.

### 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: NA/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* They are hands on and have some activities to show they are experienced in what they propose to do

*Evidence B:* It is mentioned. The assumption is that there is no local community leadership in the project.

### 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 1/5*

**Average: 1/5**

*Evidence A:* The only identified partners identified are Donors, eg NRT, TNC, SD, etc, no local or IPs identified or mentioned

*Evidence B:* There are partners mentioned but none from the local area.

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

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* Local capacity seems to be low, but the partnership is bound to provide either the skill or accord capacity building.

#### 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: NA/6 Reviewer B: NA/6*

**Average: NaN/6**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B: Very limited but it could perhaps be assisted to develop it.*

## 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: 1/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B: it answered yes, but it is possible that they may have been assisted in putting together the project proposal.*

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 5/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 5/30

Average Total Score: 5/30

Performance of Eol 165 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

