

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 220

Organization: Kalama Community Wildlife Conservancy

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Edmund Barrow	220	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	27	26	16	69
Naomi Kipuri	220	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	26	32	28	86

Performance of Eol 220 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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: These landscapes are important for a). pastoralism (Samburu indigenous people) and b). rangeland BD also has endangered charismatic species. Thus it is important for IPLC

Evidence B: The area has some wildlife species that are only found in that area in the whole world. One example is the grevy zebra.

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: Probably moderate as this is a dryland and carbon (trees, grass - esp perennial grasses) sources are more widely spaced and importance of below ground C2. Would be good to i/d which perennial grasses will be restored when A. reficiens removed

Evidence B: The area is part of the savanna in northern Kenya which has maintained a specialized type of conservation to create equilibrium. This involves strategic seasonal movement from one area to another to maximize use of resources while sustaining the environment.

B) Geographical focus in an area under IPLC governance.

3. Is the area held and managed by IPLC under community-based governance systems?

Scoring:

- IPLC governance (rights and institutions) not evident;
- Project areas are marginally under IPLC governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are partially under IPLC systems of governance (spatially or politically);
- Project areas are largely under IPLC governance, but IPLC rights and/or institutions face significant constraints;
- Project areas are held and managed under IPLC governance systems, with some limitations;
- Project areas are held and managed under strong and active IPLC governance systems

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

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: Conservancy is IPLC “owned” (land owned, though are national restrictions on how wildlife is used

Evidence B: The conservancy belongs to the IPLC but since it is part of a series of conservancies working together, there is involvement of persons who are not necessarily from the conservancy.

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: This is part of a much larger North Rangelands Trust - which covers a very large area of important BD and landscapes - mostly occupied by pastoralists and private ranches. Thus lessons from this project could easily expanded

Evidence B: Yes the unique cultural significance of the area is adequately explained. See above.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: threats - climate change - increased drought and extreme events - exacerbated by locust invasions. Land use change - threats well elucidated in EoI

Evidence B: These are fragile ecosystems which have been created over long periods of time. This means that any major interruption in the use of any part of it is bound to upset the workings of the whole.

D) Opportunities for ICI results - including enabling policy conditions, positive government support and presence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up.

6. Are enabling policy conditions in place for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed area?

Scoring:

- Legal and policy frameworks in project areas undermine IPLC governance (either actively or through absence);
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize limited rights for IPLCs over their lands and/or resources;
- Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations);
- Legal and policy frameworks actively promote the recognition of IPLC governance

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Active IPLC promotion through Community conservancies, and (if needed) Community Forest Assocs. Key to get right is balance of wildlife (and income) and livestock grazing patterns - esp in dry times - and how the two are reconciled

Evidence B: IPLC is at the core of the conservancy idea. The indigenous knowledge system of pastoralists is what makes protected areas adjacent to the conservancy viable in the long term

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Seems as though Gov well engaged - policy (national and county level), and management support (security, water etc.). But impacts of Covid on income and impacts of locusts will be a challenge. Importance of National Reserve (Samburu) close by is an important benefit (joint works, dispersal areas)

Evidence B: Both national and local government agencies provide partnership to the conservancy as they work closely together.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: A number have been initiated - conservancy itself is very important and then various management initiatives (governance, invasives, water)

Evidence B: Since the conservancy is part of a group of such structures working together, scaling up is possible. Northern Rangelands Trust acts like an umbrella for all of them.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: A number of projects relate directly to EoI, worry is scale (as the overall area is very large scale) as such interventions are often of a small pilot scale - therefore how to really go to scale

Evidence B: There is synergies with existing investment and there is complementarity in all of them


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 26.5/30

Performance of Eol 220 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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: My worry is scale of activities vs large scale of area. for example how to remove (without using Chemicals) A. reficiens and encourage grass re-growth (which spp??) - something I have done many years ago in Baringo. Water needs to be well planned for in context of effects on land condition. Charcoal is a major concern - destroying kilns - just creates poverty. Bio-gas - how can it go to scale??? - yes it is one option that should be explored. But also charcoal can be managed for (e.g. use of dead timber, plant for charcoal) and so have a fuelwood (whether charcoal or wood) management strategy that is socially and ecologically viable. This was explored in Turkana in the 1980 through a Turkana Forest Policy based on Turkana knowledge and institutions

Evidence B: They are well aligned. However, no details have been provided on how and to what extent indigenous governance structures have been utilized on a day to day basis.

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: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: Clean energy - develop a community owned management strategy; water must take into a/c potential impacts on surrounding vegetation

Evidence B: It does to a large extent. It would have been clearer if there was a time frame for each activity over time.

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Necessary scale is v. large. How to move beyond Pilot - it can be done - but requires much thought during full proposal development

Evidence B: Largely so, but some of the threats cannot be fully addressed in the time frame since they may need a longer time.

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 EoI range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with EoI range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with EoI range of investment

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Reasonably well aligned - though the challenge will be how to go to scale, for example say 100Ha of A. reficiens when there might be 100,000Ha of A. reficiens. For me real key is getting the governance and management systems in place - so invasives can be managed based on community action; water takes into account surrounding ecology et.c

Evidence B: Most of them are achievable, however some may need a longer time the community may not have control over, say climate change,

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;

- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: much of the co-financing are construction works (which is OK) but needs to be seen in context of broader landscape management

Evidence B: Actual amounts are not mentioned, but there is USAID and Swedish International Development Agency are likely to be providing adequate amounts.

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: Will need strong strategy as to how to go to scale that is part of the proposal and also part of sustainability

Evidence B: Moderate and realistic.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: For me - how will peace and harmony be realized; how will families send kids to school for free, how will they sell grass seed and so forth. Hence moderately aligned. One key for me is how we balance and manage the tradeoffs between managing for conservation and managing for livelihoods

Evidence B: Cultural and livelihood practices are at the core of the ideas of the conservancy.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: Many of the activities are short to medium term - would be good to see how management will i/c these activities into longer term strategies

Evidence B: The EOI does have clear ideas on how the project can be sustained since it has tourism activities. They also have long term commitments from some partners. Pastoralism is also said to create some needed income for sustainability to be achieved.

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: Appears well linked - though the proof will be in the "how"! and how will it be measured

Evidence B: The EOI seems to be aware of the necessary global environmental priorities, It is therefore likely to build upon it.

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: Often a challenge in such male dominated pastoral societies One way to address is to really understand roles/responsibilities/rights of men/women in different areas (food, water, house, different livestock management etc.); and then to see where the gaps are (e.g. power) as a basis for negotiating more equitable governance. Having XX% of board as women, employing women as casual labour is not real about equality and governance and can be seen as tokenistic

Evidence B: The EOI seems to be aware of what is provide in the Kenya constitution of 2019 and its objectives and activities reflect this knowledge.

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: 4/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: could have high potential but not clear at this stage

Evidence B: There is high potential demonstrated on paper, but again all the conservations in the area are likely to be learning from each other.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 32/40

Average Total Score: 29/40

Performance of Eol 220 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

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: IPLC led, though NRT (an NGO) will have a role as Kalama is part of the NRT

Evidence B: Fully led by IPLC organization with help being provided by Northern Conservation Trust.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: yes demonstrated but could be stronger in terms of who does what, and how what will be done. Is this the organizational structure of NRT or of Kalama or Girgir?? - as it looks conservation/KWS focused. Would like to see how the different officers in Kalama will implement

Evidence B: The organization is fully run by indigenous peoples .

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: Not clear as to whether partners are IPLC or NGO, e.g. Grevy Trust = NGO

Evidence B: The conservancy is part of something like a consortium of conservancies working in unison with similar objectives.

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: have the skills - but do they have the added skills to really develop up a). improved management and governance structures; b) ability to take pilot activities to scale?? - not clear

Evidence B: The organization seems to show that they have all the necessary skills and/or are able to access what they need elsewhere.

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: Weak on existing project implementation

Evidence B: It seems from past performance with other partners that they have demonstrated acceptable capacity level expertise.

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: 2/2

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Would need support in how to do this

Evidence B: The EOI seems to be aware of necessary safeguards.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 16/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 28/30

Average Total Score: 22/30

Performance of Eol 220 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

