

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 170

Organization: Mtandao wa Jamii wa Usimamizi wa Misitu Tanzania (MJUMITA)

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
170	East Africa Drylands	Tanzania	22	29	26	77
170	East Africa Drylands	Tanzania	23	33	30	86

Performance of Eol 170 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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: Forests are critical as carbon sink areas. This forests is also inhabited which makes threatened as population continues to grow. It is a Key biodiversity area in Tanzania.

Evidence B: The area covers 14 villages around the Duru-Haitemba forest, a typical dry miombo woodland vegetation located about 20 km South of Babati town centre in Manyara region in Northern Tanzania. The Duru-Hitenba forest is dominated by miombo woodlands which are important for carbon storage and sequestration, while also harboring some of the biodiversity including wildlife. One KBA is overlapping with the area. It is not an Intact Forest Landscape. The area has a very high Species Range-Size Rarity.

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: NA/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: It is a critical ecosystem for communities in the forests, and the surrounding areas.

Evidence B: The area scores low for 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The whole forest is occupied by indigenous people.

Evidence B: The project area is an Indicative Area of Indigenous and Community Land Rights. Duru Haitemba Forest rely on both informal and formal systems to regulate use. Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) was introduced in 8 villages in 1995. The 8 villages received Village Title Deeds which grant them full authority over the forest lands that border their villages. The capacity to control forests under informal/traditional law is clearly demonstrated in Duru-Haitemba. Through the elders, the villages have regulated the use of forest resources and protected the local natural resources through what are known as customary informal 'socio-environmental rules'. In Duru Haitemba there are both political and traditional governance institutions. Qaymanda is the traditional local institution that governs socio-ritual activities such as initiation and sacrifice offerings. Certain areas of the local forest came under complete protection as sacred forest under Qaymanda. The community which surrounds the forest use traditional knowledge and cultural norms in managing the forest.

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: The forest people are dependent on the forest for all their livelihoods.

Evidence B: The community which surrounds the forest use traditional knowledge and cultural norms in managing the forest. They offer sacrifices to their ancestors in the forest reserve. When there are problems in the area including hunger, diseases, unusual number of death, the elders visit the forest to offer sacrifice to their ancestors. They attached great value in forest reserve which support their daily lives. Also when there are good result of their work done include good harvesting of agricultural products they also visit the forest to thank their ancestors.

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: As population continues to grow it places the environment under stress. Also the area is under pressure from cumulative growth.

Evidence B: The EoI describes 5 main threats: population increase and over exploitation of resources which results in habitat loss and fragmentation, climate change deteriorate the quality of range land impact the quality of the ecosystem to provide ecosystem and climatic services to communities, low capacity of local institutions to monitor the management of the forest, changes in Land Use Plans of villages contributing to unsustainable practices leading to deterioration of the forest reserve and poverty increases accessing forest products as a means of satisfying the needs for their livelihood. Some forest loss between 2000-2019, no neighbouring land deals. Very high cumulative development pressures. According to Global Witness 2 land defenders were killed between 2016-2018.

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: good policy framework is there regulations are though though lack of support for implementation is lacking.

Evidence B: Tanzania's legal framework recognizes IPLC ownership and control over lands. Moreover, the law also enables the establishment of community forestry projects. (RRI 2020) ~77.41 MHa are recognized by the government as controlled by IPLCs while an additional ~2.4 Mha are recognized as owned by IPLCs. In total, this represents 75% of the country's total land area. (RRI 2015). Forest Act in 2002, which provides the legal basis for communities to own, manage, or co-manage forests under a wide

range of conditions and management arrangements and reinforces the role of the Village Councils through the formation of Village Forest Committees. The villages own the forest under legal bases. The ownership of the forest fall under Community Based Forest Management (CBFM). Village Councils manage land on behalf of the Village Assembly, and this includes demarcating land that is to be allocated to individuals and land which will remain under communal use and management for purposes such as forest management and conservation.

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: 3/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: District support structures are there though there is shortage of resources.

Evidence B: There appear to be conflicting camps of support for the recognition of IPLC control over forests between different ministries. The Tanzania Forest Service and the Ministry of Land appear to be the hubs of support. Support also appears to vary between districts at the sub-national level. (RRI 2020). Most of community members surround the forest have good perception towards the conservation of the forest. The cultural and traditional norms have contributed much on the conservation of the community. The spirit of community to their ancestors is attached strong with existence of the forest. Application of traditional knowledge has been successful toward conservation of biodiversity in the forest reserve.

8. Are there successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives in the proposed area that provide a foundation for scaling up?

Scoring:

- No IPLC-led conservation initiatives have been implemented;
- Few IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented in pilot stages only;
- Some IPLC-led conservation projects have been implemented beyond pilot stages;
- Relevant IPLC-led conservation projects have been well established for many years

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

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: There are villages that already have the governance structures in the forests. This application will be focusing on the rest.

Evidence B: There are existing local institutions which work hard to support the conservation of the forest. Existing of clan elders union known as QAYMANDA is very supportive in conservation of the forest reserve. The Village Natural Resource Committees and Village Councils also play a great role in conservation of the forest reserve on behalf of the community members.

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: 1/3

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: MJUMITA has been doing some similar work here, so this work will grow the existing work efforts already done in previous years.

Evidence B: The EoI lists one relevant other project supported by one donor and mentions several opportunities for in-kind contributions of MJUMITA, communities and the Tanzani Forest Conservation Group. The Current Cofinancing Landscape for Tanzania lists 6 projects for in total US\$ 512.5M, but none of these projects specifically target IPLCs.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 22/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 170 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: Building capacity of the local indigenous people remain the most valuable thing to do to achieve sustainability of interventions.

Evidence B: The project builds on existing IPLC governance structures, increases IPLC leadership capacities, and uses existing opportunities, relationship with communities and local government. The project will build the capacity of the community members especial youth and women on how to apply the existing good traditional knowledge and cultural norms in conservation of the forest resources which will ensure the sustainability of the forest conservation in future. The project will also capacitate the community members on application of conservation agriculture, make Land Use Plans and livelihood improvement.

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: 6/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The planned activities need to be consolidated into thematic areas instead of a long list of activities. Looks like they could use some assistance as their work is critical in the forest communities.

Evidence B: The activities are comprehensive and likely to achieve the results which are relevant to achieve the overall objectives.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: All the planned activities, though the writer of the application could not articulate well in places.

Evidence B: The activities and results address the threats identified well and builds on very good opportunities.

4. Are the activities achievable within a \$500,000 to \$2,000,000 USD budget range in a period of 5 years of project execution?

Scoring:

- Activities/results not aligned with Eol range of investment;
- Activities/results Partially aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Well aligned with Eol range of investment ;
- Activities/results Exceptionally well aligned with Eol range of investment

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: This work could be done with +/- \$500K

Evidence B: The Eol indicates the budget range is sufficient and the nature of the activities and scale of the project makes this plausible.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

Reviewer A: 1/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 1.5/3

Evidence A: Organization does appear to be well funded.

Evidence B: The EoI lists only one other project for Q 6 with a large donor, besides opportunities for in-kind contributions from MJUMITA, communities and the Tanzani Forest Conservation Group. In Q18 the EoI lists a wider range of past projects with substantial funding from a variety of sources, but these were all several years ago.

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The planned activities are critical for the forests communities.

Evidence B: The total estimated area under improved management is 99,680Ha

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: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposed activities are critical for livelihoods of the forest people.

Evidence B: The EoI in Q 13 lists clear livelihood indicators but is not very specific on cultural indicators in this question, but elsewhere mentions building capacity about traditional knowledge and institutions.

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: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: Building capacity of indigenous people to manage their resources is the most critical part for sustainability.

Evidence B: The EoI describes that long term sustainability is guaranteed through engagement and training of clan leaders and elders, training of local institutions, income generating activities, inclusive approach with women, youth and disabled, entrepreneurship training, savings programme and engagement of local government.

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: It aligns well with national legal framework.

Evidence B: Contributions of the project to national priorities as defined in NBSAPs and NDCs are well explained.

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: A good effort has been made to try to include gender mainstreaming. It could still be improved upon. If savings groups and loans will be given to women to manage it would have a huge impact in gender mainstreaming.

Evidence B: To ensure gender inclusiveness, the project will ensure that project activities are designed with gender sensitivity to ensure women, marginalized and vulnerable groups are effectively involved and explains well how they plan to achieve this.

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: This work has huge potential of turning the tide of environmental degradation.

Evidence B: The project builds on existing IPLC structures, culture and knowledge, good enabling opportunities and well established relationship with both communities and government and therefore has the potential to achieve the results in the 14 villages, which is a significant scale.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 33/40

Average Total Score: 31/40

Performance of Eol 170 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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: all the implementation requires IPLC as is about management of their forests lands.

*Evidence B:*Community members from 13 regions, 30 districts and 452 villages are members of MJUMITA.

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: The work is grounded on the local indigenous people.

Evidence B: MJUMITA have been in existence since 2000. Since then it has worked with more than 15,000 community members. MJUMITA has implemented numerous projects at community level which aim to strengthen the capacity of these communities in forest management. Example of such projects include REDD+ in Lindi and Kilosa, Forest Justice in Tanzania, Transforming the Tanzania Charcoal Sector, Leading the Change in Forest Sector, Empowering Communities in participatory forest management, REDD and Climate Change. The organization has one or more IPLC-led projects but these are directed from its base in an urban centre. The organization has one or more IPLC-led projects directed from local field offices. The organization coordinates a network of local IPLC organizations, community-based organizations or other civil society groups, which is active in one or more regions of the country.

C) Proven relevant experience in working with IPLC networks, alliances and organizations/ strength of partnerships on the ground.

3. Does Eol 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The Eol clearly demonstrates the understanding of the local environment. planned activities are also realistic.

Evidence B: Under Q 21 only two non IPLC partners are listed, but these have very limited roles and MJUMITA itself represents the communities it works with as they are all members of MJUMITA .

D) Technical expertise and capacity to address environmental problems, root causes and barriers.

4. Does Eol 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 Eol has full capacity to implement this work.

Evidence B: MJUMITA has implemented numerous projects at community level which aim to strengthen the capacity of these communities in forest management. The staff is competent and have the required skills to work with the local communities. Staff have undergone several capacity building programs to equip them with more skills to enable smooth running of the community works. MJUMITA is lead by a competent team comprising of Executive Director who as extensive knowledge and experience in

working with local communities and biodiversity conservation. The Executive Director is assisted by a Technical Advisor who has worked in biodiversity conservation for more than 15 years. The proposed communities in Duru Haitemba have experience in forest management since they were the first pilot CBFM project to be implemented in Tanzania. They have had the opportunity to implement the first CBFM project hence they have first hand experience which will be beneficial to the project. The organization has been part of or implemented GEF-funded projects.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The organization seem to have full potential for both field work and financial management.

Evidence B: The average annual budget of the organization is USD \$ 640,427. The largest annual budget of any project that the organisation is currently implementing is between US\$100,000 to US\$1 million per year. The organisation's funding comes from at least five sources, with no one source providing more than 40%. The organisation regularly produces financial reports and statements, which it makes available to the board and management, and which are always complete and delivered on time. External audits are conducted on an annual basis, recommendations are implemented, and an annual financial report is published and made publicly available. ast the organization had several projects over 200, 000, *thelargestbeing*2, 696, 600US

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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 2/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The excutive Director did attend GEF meeting in Nairobi on safeguards.

Evidence B: The executive director attended GEF expanded Constituency workshop in Nairobi Kenya from 18th – 21st February. Amongst other issues discussed were the GEF safeguards. This gave the Director some highlights on the Environmental and social safegurds and how they operate.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30

Average Total Score: 28/30

Performance of Eol 170 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

