

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 411

Organization: Coalition of Pastoralist Civil Society Organisations (COPACSO)

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
411	East Africa Drylands	Uganda	17	16	8	41
411	East Africa Drylands	Uganda	21	28	25	74

Performance of Eol 411 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: North Eastern Uganda is a key biodiversity area with high species rarity, forests.

Evidence B: The area is the Karamoja sub-region in north-eastern Uganda, which includes the districts Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Moroto and Nakapiripirit. The Karamoja landscape hosts the second largest protected area in Uganda (Kidepo National Game Park and Karenga Community Wildlife Area (KCWA) as well as axillary large wildlife reserves of Matheniko Bokora corridor and Pian Upe Corridor that act as buffer zones of the protected biodiversity on the common pastoralist rangeland area. KCWA is part of the global biodiversity hotspot (Eastern Afromontane). Several species found in the area are placed on the redlist of IUCN. Species Range-Size Rarity is high to very high in the area which contains some KBAs, but is not Intact Forest Landscape.

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: It is important for pastoralists community in this region. It is also home to some of the biggest protected areas in Uganda. Th area has high irrecoverable carbon.

Evidence B: The area has a Moderate Irrecoverable Carbon

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: The area is governed by IPLC pastoralists communities.

Evidence B: Karamoja has a long history of informal traditional governance, and a traditional system of social security and kinship bonded by family-blood and marriage. Communities are organized into clans, territorial groups, and age-sets that control resources at different scales. Governance is centered around a council of elders. The elderly persons are the primary custodians of the shrines and make decisions on use of natural resources such as water, pasture lands and forests. Younger (male) clan members are responsible for implementing and enforcing the decisions of elders. The increasing importance of state authority is leading to relegation and erosion of these traditional institutions. This has eroded the ability of traditional structures to enforce decisions, for instance around forest and rangeland management, early warning systems and migration.

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: There are too many Shrines in these areas that people use. Governed by Traditional councils of elders in each village.

Evidence B: The traditional and cultural importance of the environmental and biodiversity conservation to the pastoralists and Agro-pastoralist is that, it support livestock farming due to availability of grassland. Besides, rangelands serve as sources of other significant economic products such as bushmeat, fruits, berries, nuts, leaves, flowers, tubers, and other vegetable foods for human populations, as well as medicinal plants, building materials, thatch, fencing, gums, tannin, incense, honey and other products important to the economies of traditional rural populations. They live in clustered villages under or on top of hills with great purpose of relieving some land areas for shrine forest conservation and protection, grazing, subsistence crop farming and hunting. They preserve forests and mountains as they are a home to traditional Gods.

C) Vulnerability of the proposed IPLCs as well as their lands/waters/natural resources to threats.

5. Is the area vulnerable to threats/current risk of negative impacts to IPLC and biodiversity without action?

Scoring:

- No evident threats;
- Low threats;
- Moderate threats;
- Medium-high threats;
- High threats;
- Requires urgent action

Reviewer A: 3/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: degradation caused by overgrazing is the main threat coupled with deforestation.

Evidence B: Livestock concentrations, extractive sites and used rangeland areas that have become prone to bush fires in Karamoja are a threat to the biodiversity resource, mostly wildlife, which leads to loss of livelihoods, culture and creates human-wildlife conflicts. The continued loss of habitats for most species of plants and animals is caused by poor monoculture farming practices and uncontrolled bush burning deforestation for charcoal and construction timber. Extractives and mining have contributed largely to loss of mountain biodiversity, also resulting in gully erosion, floods, landslides, and flood. Increasing volume of invasive species are likely to spur loss of conserved species and habitats. Finally, the continued environmental degradation has caused climate change in the region resulting to desertification and thus drought. There is very limited forest loss from 200-2019, medium-high cumulative development pressures and no land deals.

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: There is good policy framework but not being implemented mainly due to lack of resources in the public purse.

Evidence B: CBD reports highlight some national IPLC support actions. While the Ugandan legal framework recognizes IPLC ownership of land and does not require land to be registered, it retains control over forests and other natural resources, while allowing for some degree of community forest and collaborative forest management. (RRI 2020). The Uganda wildlife policy 2014

allows Promotion of the interests of local communities around Conservation areas, but there is a lack of rangelands and pastoralism policy in Uganda.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There, though not much is being done as lack of funding is acute.

Evidence B: 13.45 MHa are recognized by the government as owned by IPLCs representing 67% of the country's total land area. Given the nature of legal recognition in Uganda this is the majority if not the totality of claims. (RRI 2015) There is no basis for assessing if there is government interest in implementing projects for collective land rights. However, there is a certain degree of willingness to establish projects aimed at forest conservation and protection of IPLC forest tenure rights. Decision making is centralized - so sub-national data is not necessary. (RRI 2020) Government, GEF and IUCN supported communities to establish community based managed forest landscapes in Morungole, Lowala, Timu and Katikekile and Karenga Community Wildlife 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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: There has been foundation laid by NGOs and Pastoralists organizations.

Evidence B: The local communities of Karenga, Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto and Napak have all along been planting trees (Both artificial forest and fruit trees) along the rangelands and conserved ecosystems with support from the government. Besides, there has been practice of controlled bush burning by sport hunters, community members and the Kidepo conservation area rangers. Restoration and maintenance of Cultural heritage sites like shrines, cultural villages, natural forests among others by community cultural and drama groups.

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: Some work has been done including by this applicant.

Evidence B: The EoI lists several other relevant projects supported by various donors and mentions various in-kind contributions from the communities involved in the project.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 17/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 19/30

Performance of Eol 411 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: It aligned but this application is focusing too much on talk-shopping that actual implementation of conservation on the ground. Too much theory....little action.

Evidence B: The project is well-aligned as it aims to bring at least 45% of Karamoja rangelands falling under community rangeland management plans in all the three project implementation areas of Karenga- Kaabong, Kotido-Napak and Moroto. Building capacity of traditional structures with at least 60% of traditional/ Kraal leaders and Akiriket (Traditional Shrine) attend trainings on awareness raising on rangelands and Environmental conservation laws and policies of Uganda. The 80% acceptance and adoption of the community lead Natural Resource Sharing and Management Agreement (CLNRSMA) between communities and conservation institutions of that can enhance peaceful coexistence between wildlife conservationists and pastoralists. The strengthened local leadership able to draw and implement policies and byelaws on resource governance across the landscape.

2. Does the EoI present a clear and convincing set of activities and results?

Scoring:

- The objectives and approach for this project lack clarity and cohesion, and/or do not appear to be realistic for the context;
- Activities & results defined but logic (Theory of Change) is incomplete;
- Activities and results are well-defined and cohesive but some aspects require clarification;
- The project has clear objectives and a cohesive approach with relevant activities for the context and timeline

Reviewer A: 2/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: There is too much focus on non practical conservation work. Out of numerous activities only a couple would yield practical work on the ground.

Evidence B: A comprehensive set of activities is presented in the EoI including, research, capacity building, dialogue, training that can together result in the overall intention to achieve at least a 45% of rangelands biodiversity management falling under community rangerland management plans.

3. Will the project (objectives and activities) contribute to overcoming identified threats and putting in place necessary enabling opportunities for IPLC-led conservation?

Scoring:

- Objectives and activities do not clearly address identified threats and opportunities;
- Contributions to addressing the threats and opportunities are low;
- Contributions to addressing threats and enabling conditions are slightly over-ambitious;
- The impact on threats and enabling conditions can be realistically accomplished and are sufficiently ambitious for the projects' context

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Not enough conservation work on the ground is planned. There is a dire need for more work on rehabilitation by the IPLCs here.

Evidence B: The objectives and activities address the identified threats in a comprehensive way, such as dialogues to build peace between human and wildlife conservation, energy saving stoves to reduce use of charcoal, protection and establishment of stands of native and appropriate trees to restore a portion of this lands to a minimum of its naturality.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: More focus on conservation on the ground is required. Rehabilitation and restoration work is more critical that what is planned.

Evidence B: The Eol indicates the budget range is sufficient to implement the project and this seems very plausible.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There are some opportunities but convincing enough.

Evidence B: Six other relevant projects are listed with various donors and various in-kind contributions of the involved communities are identified.

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: 1/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: Not convincing as there are not enough details on how this will be done.

Evidence B: The estimated total area under improved management is 17000 Acres (around 7,000 ha) of Land Area

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: There is some good information on shrines protection in the area.

Evidence B: Culturally, the project intends to achieve at least 1000 traditional shrines documented and restored, and 80% of elders and communities of traditional shrines report increase in regrowth of trees around the shrines. The project intends to demonstrate Capacity building trainings targeting pastoralists, women, Youth and other small holder farmers to be able to access extension

services, participate in holistic rangeland management demonstration fields that will be piloted by the project. Engage in art crafts design for tourism and income generation purposes, involved in Agroforestry and soil conservation measures in their own fields of crop production (an integrated approach of farming with trees), training on Village Saving and Loan Associations (VSLAs) models and Micro finance services. Training on improved livestock management practices as a means to support household nutrition with enough flow of livestock products like milk for malnourished children. Strengthening and equipping the community animal health workers and Community Environmental Committees on livestock and rangeland health relationship.

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: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: To a less extent.....

Evidence B: The EoI provides several guarantees to achieve long-term sustainability, including strengthening the capacity of communities and their groups to have adaptive capacity to manage their community challenges and or develop climate change adaptation and mitigation activities and promoting sustainable business rangeland models. Collaborating with local government, Conservation institutions and other stakeholders involved in biodiversity conservation and climate mitigation is considered critical to the initiative. Their involvement will not only boost complementarity and harmonization of efforts, but will also enhance commitment to ownership for the initiative.

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: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Not well articulated.....

Evidence B: The EoI mentions that The project identifies with five NBSAP strategic areas: (1) To strengthen stakeholder co-ordination and frameworks for biodiversity management; (2) To facilitate and enhance capacity for research, monitoring, information management and exchange on biodiversity; (3) To put in place measures to reduce and manage negative impacts on biodiversity; (4) To promote the sustainable use and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of biodiversity; (5) To enhance awareness and education on biodiversity issues among the various stakeholders. The EoI does not say anything about the NDCs.

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: There some good ideas on how it will be done.

Evidence B: The proposed action will continually carry out gender analysis in all programmes and support the achievement of specific gender results while developing COPASCO as an institution that embraces equality, utilizing gender appropriate and response participatory processes and tools, including using desegregated data by gender for M&E. It is also well explained how they intend to apply this in the project.

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

Average: 2/5

Evidence A: Not enough or not well thought through.....

Evidence B: The project has a good focus on strengthening IPLC leadership, resulting in IPLC-led conservation, while improving culture and livelihoods.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/40

Average Total Score: 22/40

Performance of Eol 411 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: IPLC are partners on the ground.

Evidence B: The applicant is a coalition organization of pastoralists and the implementing partners also include pastoralist organizations. Unfortunately the first section about the coalition was not readable as the area map overlaps the text.

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: NA/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Yes, but not enough information or details has been given.

Evidence B: The field partner Organisations have a collective aggregated history spanning more than 20 years of work in Karamoja (Uganda) and COPACSO brings on board more than 9 years experience on pastoral governance in Karamoja rangelands.

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: 5/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Does have good partners but not clear what not well detailed how far these partners will go in the implementation of the planned work.

Evidence B: The lead proponent represents a wide coalition of pastoralist civil society organizations and their IPLC partners have a clear role and expressed their written consent with their involvement in the proposal in annexes to the proposal. The organization coordinates at least one network of local IPLC organizations, community-based organizations or other civil society groups, which is active nationwide.

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: 4/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: They do have well qualified staff or team of experts as an NGO

Evidence B: The EoI in Q 20 explains a wide variety of skilled staff involved in the project that covers all the needed technical capacity, including experienced in Pastoralism, pastoral development, ecology, project cycle management, grants management, finance management, agriculture, rural development, conservation and communication, Gender and Rural specialisation, M&E.

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: 4/6

Average: 3/6

Evidence A: Financial capacity is lacking.....

Evidence B: The organisation's funding comes from at least two sources but a single source accounts for more than 80%, The organisation regularly produces financial reports and statements, which it makes available to the board and management, but these are often incomplete or delivered late. External audits are conducted on a periodic basis. The EoI lists é projects over 200, 000, *thelargestbeingUS* 910,000

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

Average: NaN/2

Evidence A: Not really.

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 8/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/30

Average Total Score: 16.5/30

Performance of Eol 411 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

