

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 267

Organization: The Wildlife Foundation (TWF)

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
267	East Africa Drylands		28	28	22	78
267	East Africa Drylands	Kenya	19	25	24	68

Performance of Eol 267 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The area covered is an extensive ecosystem which holds some of the largest congregation of wildlife especially large mammals. It also holds three major wildlife protected areas - Maasai Mara, Amboseli and Nairobi National Park.

*Evidence B:*• The area is a highly important global biodiversity landscape. This is because it is home to the highest concentration of large mammals globally.

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: NA/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* As extensive as it is, the area is significant for climate mitigation. It also has potential for carbon sequestration. It mentions that carbon trading is in their plan.

*Evidence B:*• While the EOI narrates impacts of climate change to pastoralists, it omits descriptions of how the landscape contributes to climate change mitigation hence no figure is provided.

### 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: 3/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The area is under the governance of indigenous peoples. The project combines two organizations, one in Narok County (TWF) and one in Kajiado County (ILEPA).

*Evidence B:*• The area is currently held under IPLC, and the Kenyan legal and policy landscape provide enabling environment. However, individual land holding as opposed to community ownership is posed as the main threat

#### 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:* It clearly explains the unique contribution that Maasai indigenous pastoralists contribute to the management and improvement of the ecosystem and its important fauna. The uniqueness of each of the three protected areas and those adjacent to them are well explained.

*Evidence B:*• The EOI robustly captures the cultural significance of the area. For example, it where sacred cultural ceremonies with a bearing on the governance of natural resources are held. Also, it permits exercise of traditional pastoralism through mobility.

#### 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:* Some of the threats mentioned include land fragmentation, invasive species and climate change among others. All of them have a negative impact on the sustainability of the whole ecosystem. Some of them require attention but for it to be effective, action might need to be collective.

*Evidence B:* The EOI makes reference to the following threats namely climate change, invasive species, habitat loss and fragmentation and environmental pollution. Left unattended, these threats risk negatively and significantly affecting biodiversity and 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

### **Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* Both the national and county government's policy frameworks are supportive of the IPLC led conservation. The policy environment that is friendly to IPLC is relatively new in wildlife conservation.

*Evidence B:* Kenya's legal and policy architecture permits IPLC-conservation initiatives in the proposed area. However, a significant challenge remains, notably rapid expansion of individual ownership as opposed to community (communal) land tenure.

### 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: 2/3*

### **Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A:* There is full government support to the approach where conservation is led by IPLC. Since the majority of wildlife reside outside protected areas and in community or private lands, both county and national governments are supportive of IPLC approach to conservation as the most sustainable to wildlife management.

*Evidence B:* As evidenced by the legal and policy architecture, Kenyan government at the central and county levels actively supports IPLC-led conservation in the proposed 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 a number of conservancies in the area that have been in operation for some time and they can be used for scaling up.

*Evidence B:* The EOI convincingly lists selected successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives based on their high impacts on biodiversity and IPLC. They include community rangers and environmental stewards program and establishment of resource and cultural centers.

## 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:* A number of complementary projects are mentioned in the EOI. They include the Lion Lights supported by WWF and implemented by TWF; Community Rangers supported by USAID and implemented by TWF and Pastoral Land Rights implemented by ILEPA. No amounts are mentioned. All three are tangentially related to project goals.

*Evidence B:* Complementary projects exist in the area. They address such aspects as pastoral land rights, community rangers and lions conservation.




Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 23.5/30

Performance of Eol 267 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:* The approach is well aligned to the objectives of ICI since the EOI proposes to work with three conservancies adjacent to protected areas. However, there are many community groups that are not in conservancies but also border areas of proposed operation. It is not clear how these areas were chosen and what happens to those that are not chosen yet they contribute equally to the sustainability of wildlife and its conservation.

*Evidence B:* The EOI is strongly aligned to the overall objective of the ICI. For example, it aims at improving the management of cultural and natural resources in the IPLC's land while simultaneously addressing drivers of environmental degradation affecting IPLC sustainable development.

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:* The aim of the EOI is to work with existing conservancies in the areas mentioned, but also with those willing to establish conservancies. There would be need to clarify which are those others and the activity would be if they are to be included.

*Evidence B:* The EOI provides clear activities. However, activities are not robustly and convincingly matched with expected results.



### 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:* The three protected areas occupy quite a large area. Considering that an unknown number of willing conservancies will also be included in the proposed project, the plan might be a bit ambitious.

*Evidence B:* There appears to be too many (unrelated) activities, with no convincing link to the expected results. They are hence slightly over ambitious.

### 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: 1/3*

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* They are well aligned except for what has already been mentioned.

*Evidence B:* The breadth of activities proposed, with weak links to the results expected makes the proposed project unlikely to be executed within the stated time period and within the budget line proposed.

### 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:* The EOI has included community contribution as part financing, but does not show amounts received from the mentioned partners.

*Evidence B:* The EOI makes reference of potential sources arising from REDD projects as well as in-kind contribution from communities. These are not concrete enough sources.

**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: NA/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* They are mentioned and indicated as moderate.

*Evidence B:* The proposed area under improved management is 40,000ha. This is very low global environmental benefits according to the indicators above.

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:* A few livelihood indicators are mentioned but are not properly detailed.

*Evidence B:* Indicators provided, covering livestock assets, and cultural heritage are cultural and livelihood results clearly derived from project goals.

## 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Indigenous governance structures for resource utilization and management have been partially described, The project would allow deeper articulation long with comprehensive biodiversity benefits that are expected to accrue.

*Evidence B:* The vision is not robust/clear enough. Substantial explanation is devoted to impacts of COVID19 and future tapping into income accruing from REDD projects. These are not concrete enough.

## 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The EOI is clearly conversant with relevant national policy priorities and gears the project to their realization.

*Evidence B:* The EOI reflects a clear understanding of national priorities. It hence robustly align its contribution to the relevant national 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: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* The EOI indicates that it plans to use the GEF guidance to advance gender equality in GEF projects and programs.

*Evidence B:* The EOI reflects carefully thought out plans for gender inclusion, including being guided by GEF "Guidance to Advance Gender Equality in GEF Projects and Programs."

## 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: 3/5*

**Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Ideas such as REDD pilot schemes and carbon trading are innovative since they have not been carried out in the proposed areas before.

*Evidence B:* Overall, the EOI demonstrate medium potential for large-scale conservation results based on the size of proposed area under improved management.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 25/40

Average Total Score: 26.5/40

Performance of Eol 267 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:* The personnel are shown and indicated to belong to IPLC. Of the two partners in proposed project, one is a Foundation based in Narok County and the other is an NGO based in Kajiado County.

*Evidence B:* This is a fully IPLC composed and led organization. The EOI for example, lists competencies of top official, comprising members of the IPLC.

### 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:* Conservancies are run by indigenous people and it is presumed the proposed project would be coordinating with the leadership on the ground.

*Evidence B:* Apart from credentials of officials, the EOI omits to provide the geographical reach. This blurs an understanding of the proponent's on-ground leadership to the proposed work.

### 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The lead proponent has long term experience and expertise in the proposed activities and has the necessary linkages both regionally and internationally.

*Evidence B:* Only one IPLC partner is listed, and role clearly outlined. This suggests the lead organization has moderate partnerships with IPLC.

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: 5/5*

**Average: 5/5**

*Evidence A:* The lead proponent has the necessary skills and experience, but there is no mention of other personnel needed to implement the project, except the one partner heading an NGO.

*Evidence B:* Credentials of key officials, combined with experience implementing GEF project demonstrate high technical capacity of the lead proponent and its partner to deliver the proposed results.

## 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: 6/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* From the expertise and experience of the lead proponent, it is assumed there is capacity, but their EOI does not mention.

*Evidence B:* Very strong, it meets all criteria. For example, one project has over \$250,000, the largest annual budget is over \$100,000-1,000,000, and its accounts are regularly audited.

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:* The lead proponent has knowledge of all relevant environmental safeguards.

*Evidence B:* The EOI answers Yes, and refers to an evaluation report of a GEF funded project.



Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 24/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 267 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

