

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 234

Organization: KUWUKA JDA – Juventude Desenvolvimento e Advocacia Ambiental

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Leo van der Vlist	234	Coastal East Africa	Mozambique	25	34	20	79
Jose, Monteiro	234	Coastal East Africa	Mozambique	15	12	18	45

Performance of Eol 234 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The project is in 4 areas in different parts of Mozambique; (1) The Maputaland Endemism Center in Southern Mozambique, part of the 35 biodiversity hotspot areas in the world. (2) The Chimanimani landscape, located in central Mozambique, in the province of Manica, part of the Chimanimani-Nyanga Endemism Center, including the mountain pasture that is part of the 35 hotspots worldwide recognized. (3) The Environmental Protection Area of the Primeiras e Segundas Islands (APAIPS), one of the largest marine areas in Africa, located between the north and center of Mozambique (Nampula and Zambézia) and an integral part of the Eastern African Marine Eco-Region and EBSAs (Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas). (4) The Landscape of Niassa bordering Tanzania and part of the largest protected area in Mozambique integrates afro-montana and riverside forests. All 4 areas include KBA's, 2 have very high and two medium Species range-Size Rarity, but they are no Intact Forest Landscapes.

*Evidence B:* There are 4 main areas proposed, not all have the same biodiversity importance rate. It is clear recommended that the focus could be on 1

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: 1/2*

**Average: 1/2**

*Evidence A:* Areas score low to moderate for Irrecoverable Carbon

*Evidence B:* I will consider moderate, just because there is Niassa and Chimanimani...the carbon density surrounding Maputo Land area and Ilhas primeiras e Segundas is low compared to the other 2 areas. Highly recommended that the focus could be on one area on intervention

## 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: 3/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The landscapes in reference are maintained through the combination of traditional, spiritual and cultural practices of local communities who live there for generations, combined with the work of State authorities and community management initiatives for natural resources (MCRN). The EoI has no very clear explanation of IPLC governance of the land.

*Evidence B:* Rural communities are present in all of the proposed areas of the project, as the country is mainly rural. However, because part of these areas are under National Conservation Areas, where there's more political management, resulting in some restrictions and constraints for the local communities management

### 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: 1/2*

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* Places of great importance in the life of local communities, include cemeteries and sacred sites as well as several archaeological sites from the early Iron Age and the da Pedra. Additionally, the traditional, cultural and spiritual practices of the peoples of this landscape resulted in community and sacred forests such as Licuati and Tembe, with a density and diversity of forest species, preserved over generations, contributing to services necessary for human, wildlife and flora life. In Chimanimani, local communities believe that spirits live on land as well as in Water. For this reason, some places in the natural environment such as streams, lagoons, springs, rock shelters in the top of the hills (some with rock paintings), gigantic trees, some thickets and forests are understood as places of great spiritual value. The Primeiras and Segundas Islands have a historical and cultural value, along the coast. Macua, which at present inhabits the region, arrived by land, while the ancient Arabs arrived by sea creating historical-cultural value of early contact with other cultures. Niassa still contains rock paintings, sacred for communities. Traditional rituals and artifacts still persist as part of the local culture.

*Evidence B:* There is a clear explanation for some of the selected areas

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Threats are clearly described for each region, including: uncontrolled burning, poaching, itinerant slash-and-burn agriculture, gold mining (artisanal mining), illegal logging, expanding commercial agriculture, illegal fishing and trade in marine and coastal resources, recent oil and gas prospecting and expansion of human settlements. This increases the vulnerability to the impact of climate change, particularly of extreme weather events such as cyclones, heavy rains and droughts. Several larger land deals in areas, significant forest loss in 3 of the 4 areas and very high Cumulative Development Pressures. Mozambique scores 62 on 2019 Global Index Map and Flower Plot for Marine Threats. According to Global Witness at least one land defender has been killed in Mozambique between 2016-2018.

*Evidence B:* There is a clear reference of the threats for the 4 proposed areas of interventions. In general habitat loss poses the general threat for the selected areas, and requires attention

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:* Mozambique's legal framework allows for the recognition of IPLC ownership of lands (DUATs) and control of forests (community forest concessions) (RRI 2015). While recognition of customary rights is established in law, full recognition requires a specific process of demarcation. ~19.1 Mha of land have been recognized by the government as owned by IPLCs and with another 1 Mha of forest land recognized as under IPLC control. In total, this represents approximately 25% of the country's total area. (RRI 2015) According to Landmark, about half of customarily-administered lands have yet to be recognized. EoI mentions

that the following government policies and strategies create opportunities for the proposed activities: Strategy and Action Plan for the Conservation of Biological Diversity aims to promote the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable and integrated use of resources also for community development. The Forestry and Wildlife Development Strategy, prioritizes the involvement of local communities in the management and conservation of forest and wildlife resources, e.g. through constitution of Natural Resource Management Committees. The Environment Law establishes fundamental aspects of environmental management that reinforce the need for community involvement in the use, conservation and preservation of natural resources. The Law of Forests and Wildlife and its Regulations emphasize the use and exploitation of forest resources and fauna by communities, including management participation and creation of institutions that represent the community. The Law of Protection, Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity, emphasizes the community conservation area as an area of sustainable use, of the community public domain, delimited, under management of one or more local communities with the right to use and benefit from the land.

*Evidence B:* The country has an extensive (and considered progressive) legal framework that recognized local communities rights, but lacks implementation. However, the proposal does not mention two main legal frameworks that supports the recognition of rights of local communities

## 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:* 1/3

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* According to CBD reports, some programmes on community management of natural resources are being implemented. The EoI mentions that the proposed activities are consistent with national policies and strategies of government agencies, so the proposed activities have full support from government entities, which protect the area of conservation of biodiversity and community management of natural resources, respectively ANAC and DINAF.

*Evidence B:* The current country Biodiversity conservation legislation, aims to promote and recognize the establishment of community conservation area,

## 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:* NA/3

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The EoI mentions several projects, including: Capacity Building of Local Communities for Sustainable Resource Management Forestry, Environmental Conservation and Reforestation in the Manyangane Community, Matutuine (2015-2017), financed by SGP / GEF / UNDP, Community Empowerment Project for Sustainable Management of Forest Resources in Manhangane (2014-2015), funded by WWF , Platform Capacity Building Project of Civil Society Organizations for Environmental Conservation and Community Development in Licuáti Forest (2012-2013), funded by Conservation International's CEPF program, Training Project for Local Communities for the Management of Natural Resources and Community Development in Catuane, (2008-2009), financed by SGP / GEF / UNDP, Capacity Building Project of Local Communities for their Active Participation in the Management of Natural Resources and Conservation of Biodiversity in the Libombos Transboundary Area (2007-2009), financed by Kelloggs Foundation,

*Evidence B:* There is no clear evidence of Local Communities implemented project. There is just a list of projects implemented in the community areas

### 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:* NA/3

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* The EoI mentions in total 11 closely related projects funded by a variety of large donors covering all 4 areas of the project, including government supported projects.

*Evidence B:* There are limited on going projects, as it also does not cover all the proposed areas. The proposal need to be specific in mention where what activities could be of relevance in complementarity.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 15/30

Average Total Score: 20/30

Performance of Eol 234 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:* The project is well-aligned as its focus is on strengthening capacity and implementation of rights of IPLC's to use and manage their territories while contributing to conserving and restoring nature and improving their livelihoods.

*Evidence B:* In general, yes, there is alignment, as the objectives of the projects aim to support governance of communities and biodiversity conservation

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: NA/6*

**Average: 6/6**

*Evidence A:* The activities and results are comprehensive, coherent and clearly presented.

*Evidence B:* The activities are not clear structured, and seems to be very repetition among the different results. There is no clear alignment between the proposed activities with the management plans of these conservation areas...in other to the project to bring add value. There is one great and useful objective that can be restructured and emphasized to focus on governance, and associate all the related activities to this objective/result



### 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The objectives and activities build on enabling opportunities, previous related projects and clearly address the threats effectively, while making use of established relations with governmental institutions.

*Evidence B:* There was a clear description of the threats, but no clear description on how the objectives will cover them

### 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: NA/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The Eol indicates the proposed activities are feasible within this budget range and the planned activities and scale make it plausible.

*Evidence B:* The amount range won't be enough to cover the 4 suggested areas of intervention, while delivering all the suggested activities. It is high recommended that the project focus on one or two key areas.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;

- Significant

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

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The EoI mentions 7 relevant projects with a wide variety of larger donors that create good opportunity for co-funding. No in-kind contributions mentioned.

*Evidence B:* There is a list of potential sources, but no clear evidence that there will be allocation of resources.

## 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: 2/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The estimated total area under improved management mentioned in the EoI is 51,919,909 hectares. This seems exceptionally high in relation to the planned activities and budget and the estimated restored areas (5ha) and areas under improved practices (7,000 Ha), but potentially the project can influence awareness and policies at a larger scale. Therefore determined as moderate.

*Evidence B:* The proposed improved area does not seem to be realistic, as there's no clear evidence on how these areas are going to be measured, and considering the threats associated in each of these areas. A more justification is required in the proposal

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:* Cultural indicators proposed, but no explanation how the project will contribute to these indicators. No livelihood indicators measured but these are clear from the described planned activities.

*Evidence B:* The indicators and parameters are not clearly aligned with the objectives. Most of the indicators are related to cultural sites, local language which are aspects that are already endogenous for the local communities and selected sites

## 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:* NA/3

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The EoI mentions that project activities will continue to have an impact after the end of the project, through the structures that will be created / established in the communities, specifically the natural resource management committees and the involvement of community leaders, women and the transfer of knowledge and implementation by local groups, will allow actions to continue even after the end of the project. Additionally, the project will establish partnerships, collaboration and coordination with public entities and partners, that will continue after the project ends.

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* The EoI explains to which parts of the national priorities as defined in NBSAPs and NDC as well as several other policies will contribute.

*Evidence B:* There is a clear evidence of listing aligned priorities.

## 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The EoI demonstrates awareness of specific roles of women, and explains how the project intends to include women 50% in all activities and management and leadership positions.

*Evidence B:* Despite focusing on 50% women integration, there's no clear approach on how it is going to be achieved. Nevertheless, these type of metric aiming is dangerous in a context of local communities and rural development, particularly when Governance system are not consolidated.

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: 2/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* The project is very focused on IPLC capacity building, including to establish Community committees for the management of natural resources, increase skills on community management, biodiversity conservation and local development and to participate effectively in policy dialogues with various levels of governance.

*Evidence B:* NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 34/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 12/40

Average Total Score: 23/40

Performance of Eol 234 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 3/6**

*Evidence A:* The applicant seems to be an NGO with great experience in working with local communities and building their capacities. The project aims for strengthening IPLCs management and local structure capacities, awareness and implementation of IPLC rights and building capacity to their effective participation in decision-making processes.

*Evidence B:* 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* The organization coordinates at least one network of local PICL organizations, grassroots organizations community or other civil society groups, which is active in one or more regions of the country. Description of staff qualifications and previous projects demonstrate on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work.

*Evidence B:* There is evidences of conducting similar work, but no clear evidence of lesson learned, as most of the approached proposed have not work in the past.

### 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: 2/5*

**Average: 1.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The partners listed in the EoI are governmental, conservational, scientific and NGO's. No IPLCs listed as partners.

*Evidence B:* There is clear partners listing, but no evidence that they will play a role in the project, and how will they play a role in the project. Most of the institutions are those publics that have a natural role in promoting conservation and sustainable management of natural resources

### 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: 2/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* the program manager is a Master in Ecology with work experience in conservation and community forest over 22 years old, in addition to having participated in the preparation of management of some conservation areas in Mozambique including final program evaluations. The technicians are specialized in Environmental Management and Community Development; Education Community Environmental; Geography-Geographic Information Systems; and Tourism based on nature (ecotourism), all trained in national superior institutions. The specializations of the organization's staff are combined with the extensive experience accumulated in areas of work with local communities, grassroots community organizations, civil society, private sector, government at different levels. The organization has past experiences with GEF funded projects.

*Evidence B:* There is general description about the skills under the project, but most of them are correlated, without a clear adding value and complementarity of them. The great point in this section is the fact that they have been recipients of the GEF funds in the past.

## 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:* The average annual budget for KUWUKA JDA is approximately US \$ 400,000. The largest annual budget for any project that the organization is currently implementing is in the range of \$ 100,000 to \$ 1 million per year. The organization's funding comes from at least three sources, with no source providing more than 60%. The organization regularly produces reports and financial statements, which it makes available to management and administration, which are always complete and delivered on time. External audits are carried out annually, recommendations are implemented and an annual financial report is published and made available to the public. One project over \$200,000, is listed.

*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:* 2/2

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* KUWUKA JDA has experience with the SGP / GEF safeguard policies having implemented OP5-related initiatives in Mozambique. Past initiatives supported by the SGP / GEF / UNDP Mozambique offices have enabled the organization to become familiar with the GEF's safeguard policies, including other policies of bilaterals / multilaterals and safeguards, such as when the CEPF program was financed by Conservation International.

*Evidence B:* There is no direct evidence, but, the organization implemented some GEF funded projects through other partners, therefore the knowledge might be present.





Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 20/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 18/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 234 in Coastal East Africa - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

