

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 396

Organization: Sustainable Natural Resources Management Association (SUNARMA)

### Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
396	East Africa Drylands	Ethiopia	23	32	25	80
396	East Africa Drylands	Ethiopia	26	29	23	78

Performance of Eol 396 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:* Very high Biodiversity in the targeted ecosystems.

*Evidence B:* As part of the Eastern Afro Montane Hotspot, the proposed areas are high in endemism and species rarity. The areas include 85kHa of Juniper Forests as well as drylands and rangeland savannah. Biodiversity and species endemism and rarity are thoroughly described in the EoI.

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:* Moderate irrecoverable carbon.

*Evidence B:* Irrecoverable carbon is moderate throughout the area. Current dependence on charcoal production for fuel income is a significant threat to forests and carbon sequestration. Change in frequency of droughts and increased seasonal flooding are also a major threat to both biodiversity and human livelihoods.

### 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:* IPLC organized under GADA system of Traditional governance which is well respected by local people.

*Evidence B:* Per the EoI Part 1, Q.2 "The natural resources in Borana zone (of mainly forest, pasture and water) are traditionally managed under the Gada system, the indigenous democratic socio-political system of the Oromo people. Gada is a traditional system of governance developed from knowledge gained by community experience over generations, and is regarded by the Oromo people as their common heritage and a key mark of their identity... The Gada system was inscribed on the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2016

#### 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:* Well explained. Place has numerous sacred sites.

*Evidence B:* Significance of sites, their biodiversity and the importance to culture and cultural governance is clearly explained. Also included are threats to continued traditional practice.

#### 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:* Degradation and overgrazing. Critical need for rehabilitation. Urgent need to intervene to support governance .

*Evidence B:*Threats include: overgrazing and human exploitation, Climate change, poverty and government policies that prioritize agricultural expansion and include resettlement of non-Borana peoples into the area who do not respect traditional Borana practice. Threats are interrelated, increasing severity.

## 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:* There is good policy framework to support this implementation. IPLC also organised themselves.

*Evidence B:*National and regional policies support Participatory Forest Management (PFM), which is the key approach of the EOI activities. Support for PFM within the 1995 Constitution, the 2005 NBSAP, the 211 CRGE Strategy, and Ethiopia's 2016-2020 Five Year Development Plan are clearly described.

### 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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3*

### **Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Government has laid good foundation for the IPLC led conservation efforts.

*Evidence B:* See Q.6 above. Per the EoI, "...In its short-medium development policy, the government recognises the importance of investing in pastoralism in order to improve the food security situation amongst pastoralists. This underlying legal situation provides the basis for the project's focus on improving pastoralist communities' access to, and appropriate use and management of, forest resources, along with increasing household income from the sale of non-timber forest products to local markets.

## 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:* There has been good work done and being done on the ground to rehabilitate ecosystems.

*Evidence B:* The EoI partner organization, Gayo Pastoral Development Initiative (GPDI), is a local IPLC organization working for 17 years in the Borana indigenous pastoral lands implementing relevant projects.

## 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:* There are few projects that are being implemented already on the ground.

*Evidence B:* Investments with GPDI via INGOs (Swiss Church Aid, The Christensen Fund) have supported complementary IPLC projects. EoI does not include level of investment. Applicant partners SUNARMA and GPDI indicate in-kind contribution (equipment, satellite imagery and data) and in-kind contributions from communities.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 24.5/30

Performance of Eol 396 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:* It is exceptionally aligned with GEF or ICI objectives

*Evidence B:* The Approach, Outcomes, and Activities are well aligned with ICI. Outcomes focus on improved and participatory forest management, improving the capacity of IPLC to improve management, and improving livelihood opportunities to support good practice.

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

Scoring:

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

*Reviewer A: 6/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A:* Excellent! Activities are well articulated.

*Evidence B:* Since the EoI is prepared by organizations on behalf of the communities in the target areas, a clear consultation process including all relevant stakeholders should be defined to ensure the project follows a rights based approach, that the communities have given their free, prior and informed consent, and support from stakeholders-such as relevant government agencies supports an enabling environment for successful outcomes.

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:* Excellent and realistic approach is proposed.

*Evidence B:* This depends on the level of investment requested and the scope of the full project. The activities described in the EoI are appropriate to the outcomes and support IPLC led PFM and conservation.

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: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* They are well aligned, and achievable within this budget.

*Evidence B:* There is a relatively small area (85Kha), but with 5000 households and 35k direct beneficiaries stated. Range of investment is sufficient.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant



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

**Average: 1.5/3**

*Evidence A:* There is co-financing in the work being done.

*Evidence B:* Some current investment from INGOs to GPDI for work in the area but amount not given. Only in-kind contributions from Applicant organizations and communities defined.

**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:* They are excellent for the investment.

*Evidence B:* Low to moderate (87kHa) land under improved management. Significant impact potential to 35k individuals in 5000 households.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* Excellent alignment as they work directly with IPLC who are probably involved in planning and implementation.

*Evidence B:* PFM, traditional management, and livelihood Indicators clearly stated and relate to project

## 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:* This laying and excellent foundation on which future funding may be built on.

*Evidence B:* Much of the work envisioned is foundational and would catalyze longer-term benefits which would require a sustainable source of additional financing. Successful achievements of outputs should enable project to attract needed additional financing.

## 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 aligned well to national priorities articulated by both constitution and environmental policies.

*Evidence B:* See also Sec.1, D.6. Contributions to and synergies with NBSAP and NDCs clearly described, as well as within the context of Ethiopia's CRGE Strategy.

## 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 is a clear approach on how women involvement will be improved with clear targets of numbers in decision making bodies.

*Evidence B:* Realistic assessment of conditions and barriers to gender mainstreaming and well considered activities. Men included along side women in training.

## 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:* Excellent innovation with clear vision is being proposed.

*Evidence B:* EoI has well thought out approach to sustainability and impact, articulating conditions to create transformative impact. EoI includes discussion of phase out of NGO support, innovation in forest management governance blended with traditional practice and impact at scale.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 32/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 29/40

Average Total Score: 30.5/40

Performance of Eol 396 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: 2/6*

**Average: 3/6**

*Evidence A:* This approach is proposing and excellent partnership between an NGO and an IPLC.

*Evidence B:* EoI has been submitted by and Ethiopian NGO with IPLC leadership and an IPLC implementing partner on behalf of communities in three woredas (local admin units) in Oromia state.

#### B) Demonstrated on the ground leadership related to Indigenous Peoples and/or Local Community Conservation.

2. Does the lead proponent demonstrate on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work?

Scoring:

- None demonstrated;
- Limited demonstration of relevant on-ground leadership;
- Demonstrated on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work;
- Exceptional and long-standing on-ground leadership relevant to the proposed work

*Reviewer A: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* The partnership with IPLC Pastoralists makes an excellent sense.

*Evidence B:* Extensive description of work and results of both organizations.

#### 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The letter of support from the IPLC explains it all.

*Evidence B:* The indigenous partner organization GPDI is the lead implementing partner with support from SUNARMA.

#### 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:* Between the NGO and IPLC all required skills are present.

*Evidence B:* Skills of the lead organization and implementing IPLC organizations are clearly and extensively described. Lead NGO SUNARMA has extensive experience and expertise and is led by an indigenous person. It has participated in the GEF SGP. Qualifications of GPDI, the IPLC implementing organization are also clearly and extensively described-including local expertise and leadership.

#### 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 applicant NGO has strong financial skills required and excellent experience in managing donor funding.

*Evidence B:* Project examples included. Skills and personnel described in detail.

## 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:* Good experience displayed.

*Evidence B:* Lead organization has experience with GEF Small Grants Program safeguards, as well as DFID and EU.

### Section 3:

*Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30*

*Reviewer B Total Score: 23/30*

**Average Total Score: 24/30**

Performance of Eol 396 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

