

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 85

Organization: HYFRO (Hydrauliques Sans Frontières)

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Edmund Barrow	85	Congo Basin	DR Congo	25	29	25	79
Jamison, Ervin	85	Congo Basin	DR Congo	22	28	21	71

Performance of Eol 85 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score



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

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

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

Scoring:

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

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

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* Albertine rift, Congo Basin, Tayna National Reserve - HYFRO actually manage the reserve based on agreement with Min Envr and with ICCN. V. imp global BD (lowland gorillas, Okapi etc.

*Evidence B:* The area is of high significance for its intact forests and species range-size rarity.

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

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

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

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* Lowland trop forest with high C2 stocks and C2 mitigation measures could support the sustainability of the Reserve

*Evidence B:* The area appears to have a value of carbon density of >100 t/ha

### 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:* But this assumes HYFRO are managing the reserve and that all indigenous people are involved as stated

*Evidence B:* This is somewhat unclear from the proposal

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

*Scoring:*

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

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

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* V.g explanation of importance to IPs - ranging from sacred forests and plants, to IP involvement in border demarcation, and traditional chieftans in management, and respect for IP taboos (e.g. on use of certain species

*Evidence B:* Clearly described as a sacred forest

#### 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: 2/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* Land conversion to Agric - key to resolve, also challenge on how to engage with mining sector and reduce illegal timber. How to manage the exotic Chinchona will be key. Such threats have to be mitigated but in a manner that offers alternatives for local IPs

*Evidence B:* There are medium-level threats, primarily conversion to 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:* 3/3 *Reviewer B:* 3/3

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Supportive policy exists - but not sure how effective given it is DRC is questionable - but it does enable community management to help secure the Reserve area. really important to build on such local management and IPLC ownership of the reserve area

*Evidence B:* Effective enabling policy conditions appear to be in place

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:* Gov supports (policy esp), but Gov is probably very weak on the ground - and community governance effectively replaces role of Gov - though Gov supports Community role

*Evidence B:* There is ample reference to legal decrees for support

8. Are there successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives in the proposed area that provide a foundation for scaling up?

*Scoring:*

- No IPLC-led conservation initiatives have been implemented;
- Few IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented in pilot stages only;
- Some IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented beyond pilot stages;
- Relevant IPLC-led conservation projects have been well established for many years

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

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* It looks as though this a real community led initiative and it seems to have been done without much donor support - which is really great - means community ownership (and not project ownership!!). This is something sensitive GEF support can build on and empower

*Evidence B:* There are a few examples of succesful initiatives, including in the Equator Initiative database

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:* But important - in terms of supporting local capacity and local chieftancy. Again this is something to build on

*Evidence B:* Numerous examples cited for potential synergies


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 23.5/30

Performance of Eol 85 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 1)



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

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

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

Scoring:

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

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

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Activities could be further developed; for ex. Sacred sites mapped, with management plans and integrated into ICCA data base. Same can apply for Customary authorities and gender - to really develop and spell out Community governance structure for the reserve (who does what, where; who is responsible)

*Evidence B:* The formation of a community conserved area is clearly aligned

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: 6/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* Building governance and management capacity of IPLC for the Tayna Reserve will be key to long term sustainability. But how will the project develop this capacity and have it legitimated locally and by Gov?? - should have more explanation

*Evidence B:* This integrated set is clear and convincing

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: 3/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* not clear how threats (eg. agric, mining, timber) will be address. Will the Park management authority have the power to influence farmers, miners, timber concessions to stop clearing, practice more environmentally friendly mining

*Evidence B:*The activities are realistic to address threats

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:*This is feasible within the budget and timeline

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Moderate is probably good - as it will mean the projects will not be swamped with donor funding which may well alter the nature of "ownership" which really must remain with local level and not be driven by whims of donors!



*Evidence B:* A few are identified; the scope is unclear

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

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* But restored lands looks very ambitious!!!

*Evidence B:* The total is 365,000 ha

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

**Average: 1/3**

*Evidence A:* some livelihood indicators, but could also really include such areas as building on IP knowledge (trees, plants, fauna), and institutions (sacred groves, species)

*Evidence B:* Indicators are missing.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* This project likely to support ability for IPLC to well manage the Reserve in the longer term, which too few projects do - importance of improved governance, empowerment of local communities and their ability to manage (but also sanction)

*Evidence B:* There is some thought toward long-term sustainability

### 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Well aligned and clear understanding of national links, even though imp of distant government may be weak in the area but this has empowered IPLC to fill the management gap with Gov Policy support - which is really great

*Evidence B:* Clear coherence with both documents

### 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:* Needs clarity on gender roles/responsibilities (what are they, are they important, are they respected) and respect for the differing gender roles

*Evidence B:* Strong integration of gender considerations

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

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* This can really offer approaches of how IPLCs can take on governance and management roles and responsibilities (including sanction) of PAs and so move away from State owned and controlled real-estate. Many (in DRC and further afield) could learn from this include State Conservation and PA authorities

*Evidence B:* Could be replicated in many other areas


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/40

Average Total Score: 28.5/40

Performance of Eol 85 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 2)



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

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

1. Is the EoI led by an IPLC organization?

Scoring:

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

*Reviewer A: 6/6 Reviewer B: NA/6*

**Average: 6/6**

*Evidence A:* HYFRO in lead - and lead on approach. Likely to also involved other groups - eg. Gov., NGOs - but also has a large number of IPLC partners

*Evidence B:* Appears to be beneficiary, not IPLC-led

### 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:* HYFRO seems to demonstrate on ground leadership and ability to work with a range of different partners and donors, as well as implementing reasonably sized projects

*Evidence B:* The initiative has a solid history of expertise

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

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Well identified - one worry - will have to ensure clarity on roles and responsibilities of different IPLCs

*Evidence B:* A wide number of partners cited

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

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* No GEF but has been supported by Multi-laterals - therefore is familiar with safeguards. One worry - is that there seems to be a huge staff list for HYFRO (Q20) - here form should follow function and is not clear - What will be done (activities) and who will implement (skills required) - at present it is a bit of a shopping list!!

*Evidence B:* They only lack GEF experience, else ample display of skills, capacities, experience.

#### 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: 6/6*

**Average: 6/6**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* Very solid experience.

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: 2/2*

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* Not with GEF, but other multi lateral donors

*Evidence B:* Yes, with justification

### Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30*

**Average Total Score: 23/30**

Performance of Eol 85 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

