

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 293

Organization: FONDATION POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT ET LE DEVELOPPEMENT AU CAMEROUN (FEDEC)

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Edmund Barrow	293	Congo Basin	Cameroon	20	24	19	63
Olivier Langrand	293	Congo Basin	Cameroon	23	18	11	52

Performance of Eol 293 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: A large National Park area - with different zones for different uses. Key BD species - mandrill, gorilla, chimpanzie

Evidence B: The area of Campo Ma'an National Park is known for its exceptional biodiversity. The forest and freshwater ecosystems are diverse with many endemic species, distinct from those of the Congo Basin. It harbors some iconic species such as Lowland Gorilla and Mandrill.

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: Tropical forest with high standing BD values (though probably not much below ground)

Evidence B: Campo Ma'an National Park is largely constituted of intact forests which are important for carbon sequestration (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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: These appear to be IP lands, but as part of NP - so links between PA authorities and IPs - could lead to conflict. Any co-management regime will have to be equitable

Evidence B: There is an active convention signed for Campo Ma'an National Park to be co-managed by the park authority and IPLCs.

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: In general terms - could be more specific as this can provide basis to connect IP knowledge and institutions with co-management

Evidence B: The EoI describes well the cultural significance of Campo Ma'an National Park to IPLC.

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Poaching (who poaches??? - local people or commercial) seems very important also unsustainable harvesting of medicinal and timber

Evidence B: Poaching is rampant and non-indigenous (allogeneic) populations are illegally exploiting natural resources at the expense of the IPLC.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Support exists in constitution. Forest and Wildlife policies being revised to be more IPLC supporting. This project could be a good pilot for much wider use

Evidence B: The legislation of Cameroon allows for IPLC to co-manage natural resources. Campo Ma'an National Park is co-managed by the park authority and IPLC with an active convention signed by both parties.

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: This being done through co-management - but not sure how such co-management will be able to resist poaching, illegal use and so forth

Evidence B: The legislation of Cameroon is favorable to the co-management of land and natural resources by IPLC.

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: Co-management work will be key to build on and develop ore wideley. Pilot project in implementation - esp along he periphery of the NP

*Evidence B:*The co-management of Campo Ma'an National Park has been under implementation for almost ten years but the involvement of IPLC appears sub-optimal.

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: NA/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: Rubber agro-forests and IP awareness raising

*Evidence B:*Only two activities are listed in the proposal and are actually implemented by FEDEC.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 21.5/30

Performance of Eol 293 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: the 6 activities all contribute to enhanced governance of co-managed areas - but will require equity in power relations between IPLCs and PA authorities

Evidence B: The Eol proposes to revise the current convention signed by the Campo Ma'an National Park authority and IPLC to give more responsibilities to IPLC and secure the land tenure against activities of non-local (allogeneic) populations.

2. Does the Eol 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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Yes - well defined and clear - would be good to have an overall outcome stated (functioning well managed co-management agreements and activities with security of rights respected)

Evidence B: The objectives and activities planned in the Eol are sound.

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: NA/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: building capacity, negotiating such co-management agreements will take much longer than seems to be presented - as all different stakeholders need to be involved and agree - esp gender

Evidence B: The proposed objectives and activities are unlikely to have a strong impact on the threats affecting the natural resources of Campo Ma'an National Park which are constituted by intense poaching and illegal exploitation of forest resources by non-local (allogeneic) populations. The role of the park authority in controlling illegal activities must be presented as a key element to be achieved in order to allow IPLC to safely co-managed natural resources of Campo Ma'an National Park.

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: Activities will need to really focus on what is needed to achieve Co-management agreements - it is there, but not clear yet

Evidence B: The proposed activities can be implemented in the proposed time frame and budget. They are indeed modest, but proportionate with the number of beneficiaries

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

Average: 1/3

Evidence A: Seems to be 2 x small projects

Evidence B: There is no indication of significant additional source of co-financing.

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: 2/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: But if such co-management agreements can be formalized it offers huge potential for other PAs to do likewise

Evidence B: Estimated at 80,000 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: but the key will be how these indicators are measured

Evidence B: The additional cultural and livelihood results are not really quantified nor described precisely qualitatively speaking.

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: 1/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: sustainability appears to be based on a). functioning Co-management arrangements; and b) some support from the Foundation (lead)

Evidence B: The proponent commented on the long-term financing of the activities mentioning the existence of funding available from its own organization to continue the activities after the first five-year funding cycle. Nothing is mentioned regarding the long-term impact of the project.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Esp GESP; also to NP existing Management plan

Evidence B: The project is well aligned with the NBSAP as Campo Ma'an National Park is an important site for biodiversity conservation and since the approach of co-management with IPLC is considered a national priority.

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: in training and activities - but not clear on role in Co Management where equity should be strived for

Evidence B: Gender is present in different parts of the EoI and a plan to have gender-balanced activities is envisioned.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 1/5

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: if co-management agreements are well and equitably negotiated - so it is not lopsided in favour of PA authority

Evidence B: The proposed activities are restricted to a small area of Campo Ma'an National Park and will benefit a very small number of IPLC (Bagyéilis).


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/40

Average Total Score: 21/40

Performance of Eol 293 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The EoI submitted by FEDEC, a NGO based in The Netherlands with a country office in Yaoundé, indicates the involvement of three partners of which two are IPLC-led groups.

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: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Demonstrated but will they be able to support the negotiations on co-management

Evidence B: The on-the-ground leadership is limited and the staff of FEDEC quite limited in terms of number and capacity.

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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: Seems as though some of the partners have the important negotiation skills for successful Co-Management

Evidence B: The two IPLC organizations that are mentioned as partners do not have clearly defined roles assigned to them in the context of the project.

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: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: FEDEC has some capacity that will allow to achieve the proposed results. However, the transfer of capacity from NGO to IPLC is unlikely to be effective considering the apparent limited capacity of the lead organization.

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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 2/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: But does not state annual budget

Evidence B: The information to assess the project and financial management capacity of the proponent are not provided.

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: and not clear if such safeguards been used for other donors (e.g. WB, bi-laterals

Evidence B: No GEF experience but familiar with safeguards without additional information provided.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 19/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 11/30

Average Total Score: 15/30

Performance of Eol 293 in Congo Basin - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

