

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 187

Organization: Ndera Community Conservancy

Eol Metadata

| name | Eol | Geography | state | Section 1 | Section 2 | Section 3 | Total |
|--------------|-----|----------------------|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Naomi Kipuri | 187 | East Africa Drylands | Kenya | 20 | 13 | 12 | 45 |
| David Wilkie | 187 | East Africa Drylands | Kenya | 19 | 21 | 18 | 58 |
| John Watkin | 187 | East Africa Drylands | Kenya | 19 | 25 | 19 | 63 |

Performance of Eol 187 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: 3/5 Reviewer C: 3/5

Average: 3.33/5

Evidence A: The area has some species of flora and fauna that are only found in the area and are endangered.

Evidence B: Section of the Tana river riparian forest appears to be included as a KBA

Evidence C: Tana River is a vitally important habitat for several Critically Endangered species.

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: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The area includes a small strip of forest dependent on water supply from the river but this is dwindling owing mainly to human activity and climate change. traditional rules of management have waned, leading to poor management of the forest and natural resources.

Evidence B: Appears to be <50 t/ha

Evidence C: Surprisingly, the riverine forests have high carbon storage potential (Glenday 2008).

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

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The area has pastoralists and farmers -the Wardei and Pokomo respectively. They share the area for their livelihoods but they have divergent needs, expectations and perhaps concerns.

Evidence B: Conservancy formally owned by Pokomo and Wardei communities

Evidence C: NA

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: There is mention of a council of elders without explanation of which of the two communities they belong and whether it is an indigenous structure. So the significance of the area culturally is difficult to discern.

Evidence B: No explanation in response to Q2

Evidence C: NA

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 Reviewer C: 3/5

Average: 3.33/5

Evidence A: Presently, there seems to be haphazard utilization of the area and unsustainable use of resources therein. There are also too many threats.

Evidence B: Illegal logging, poaching, rangeland degradation and invasive plant species

Evidence C: NA

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: 2/3

Evidence A: There are national forest and wildlife agencies operating in the area observing existing legal and policy frameworks. But it is not clear whether they are indigenous-led. The organogram shows only two wardens as belonging to the Wardei community, Pokomo are not mentioned. Yet livelihood projects does not mention any that support pastoralism, they are all oriented to supporting farming activities.

Evidence B: Laws and government agencies support IPLC efforts to manage their lands

Evidence C: NA

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: NA/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There is full government support, but it has not tried to balance the needs of pastoralists and farmers. This means that there is lack of orientation of indigenous ideas of conservation.

Evidence B: Laws and government agencies support IPLC efforts to manage their lands. See Q5

Evidence C: NA

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: Community conservancies exist in the country and region. However, most of the existing ones are carved out in lands belonging to single communities, as opposed to mixed farming and pastoralism.

Evidence B: Indication of activities - no indication of start dates

Evidence C: NA

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 Reviewer C: 1/3

Average: 1.33/2

Evidence A: There are investments but not quite similar, see above, but some lessons could be derived.

Evidence B: NRT and KWS support services

Evidence C: NA

Section 1:


Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 19.33/30

Performance of Eol 187 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: NA/3 Reviewer B: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The project has done little to make the project inclusive by including both indigenous and local communities appropriately. The approach is not clear.

Evidence B: Used a table with Objectives, Activities and Outcomes

Evidence C: NA

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 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 4.67/6

Evidence A: The activities and results need clarity. But more significant is the inclusion of all communities in the area to participate and benefit from the initiative for better results to be realized.

Evidence B: Refer to table Q8

Evidence C: NA

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: There is an attempt to do so. However, exclusion of some community members or inequitable sharing of positions and benefits is likely to create other threats such as conflict.

Evidence B: Slightly over ambitious

Evidence C: This scoring scale needs to be revised.

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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The EOI does not indicate it.

Evidence B: NA

Evidence C: NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: There is mention of partners but there is no indication what their monetary contribution is. There is community contribution in kind.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*NA

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: NA/5 Reviewer B: 3/5 Reviewer C: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Not provided.

*Evidence B:*See Table Q12

*Evidence C:*NA

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: 2/3 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 1.67/3

Evidence A: The only possible cultural result is the council of elders but it is not mentioned which indigenous community the institution belongs.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*NA

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:* NA/3 *Reviewer C:* 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Long term vision of sustainability is not clear.

*Evidence B:*Revenue from planted Mango trees - more a benefit than pathway to sustainability

*Evidence C:*NA

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:* 2/3 *Reviewer C:* 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The EOI clearly mentions many national priorities and guiding principles but these do not seem to have been used to position the project.

*Evidence B:*Not clear links to Kenya NBSAP

*Evidence C:*NA

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 Reviewer C: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Gender consideration has been thought about and discussed but it has received no real consideration.

Evidence B: Seems like Kenya has a 1/3 female membership rule for a governance group

Evidence C: NA

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: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Perhaps the inclusion of other IPs' and/or local communities ideas in the EOI would have enriched the proposal.

Evidence B: No real innovation

Evidence C: NA

Section 2:


Reviewer A Total Score: 13/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/40

Reviewer C Total Score: 25/40

Average Total Score: 19.67/40

Performance of Eol 187 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: Community Conservancies are reconized legally as independent entities. However they work closely with relevant related sectors.

*Evidence B:*NA

*Evidence C:*NA

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: 4/6 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 3.33/6

Evidence A: There is mention of various personnel in the organogram but it is not clear what numbers are on the ground.

*Evidence B:*The conservancy board has already designed and overseen the implementation of a suite of conservation and livelihoods activities

*Evidence C:*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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5 Reviewer C: 3/5

Average: 2.67/5

Evidence A: Northern Rangeland Trust is mentioned but it is said to provide third party support to the conservancy and other services. It does not play a day to day role.

Evidence B: Table in Q21

Evidence C: NA

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

Average: 2.67/5

Evidence A: The Northern Rangeland Trust is said to have capacity, but it is not clear how it will contribute to the day to day running of the project,

Evidence B: Appear to be relying on NRT to provide technical assistance and help with fund raising

Evidence C: NA

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 Reviewer C: 4/6

Average: 2.67/6

Evidence A: The actual capacity of staff is not mentioned, but there is a conservancy structure as well as a board. These could be built upon with some support.

Evidence B: Unclear but they did mention they rely on NRT for support

Evidence C: 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: NA/2 Reviewer B: NA/2 Reviewer C: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Not mentioned.

Evidence B: See Q27 Q28

Evidence C: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 12/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Reviewer C Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 16.33/30

Performance of Eol 187 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

