

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 143

Organization: SUNARMA

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
ELIFURAHA LALTAIKA	143	East Africa Drylands	Ethiopia	24	27	23	74
Naomi Kipuri	143	East Africa Drylands	Ethiopia	21	31	14	66

Performance of Eol 143 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: 2/5*

**Average: 3/5**

*Evidence A:* The proposed territory is a unique habitat to endemic bird species. This makes it a globally significant territory.

*Evidence B:* The area combines dryland forest and savanna grasslands. The area supports large numbers of livestock and livelihoods of pastoralists whose income derives solely from livestock. Unless they are managed well, such areas are likely to deteriorate into deserts.

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:* The EOI is explicit that forests in the proposed territory play an important role in the carbon sequestration. However no quantifiable data is provided.

*Evidence B:* The areas should contain moderate to high carbon sequestration since from description, it seems to be similar with other grasslands in the region.

### 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:* The area is strongly managed by IPLC under the well known Gada system of the Oromo people. The system appears in the UNESCO's list of Intangible Cultural Heritage of humanity.

*Evidence B:* While the area seems to be largely held and managed by IPLC through a very elaborate indigenous governance system, it is apparent that some non indigenous people play significant roles. This is explained by the fact that there is low capacity among indigenous peoples.

#### 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 EOI clearly outlines the unique cultural significance of the proposed territory. For example, reference is made to more than 100 cultural sacred sites that need protection.

*Evidence B:* Yes, It is well explained. The project adequately explains the significance of area, its utilization and sustainable management to control degradation and climate change.

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

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

*Scoring:*

- No evident threats;
- Low threats;
- Moderate threats;
- Medium-high threats;

- High threats;
- Requires urgent action

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

### **Average: 3.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Ecological threats as well as land degradation and invasive species as well as social challenges such as poverty are clearly articulated. Combined, they point to agency of addressing the negative impacts.

*Evidence B:* There are too many threats including land degradation, encroachment by invasive species, habitat loss due to drought and climate change, etc. All these need urgent action.

## 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:* While reference is made to an IPLC's friendly constitution (no specific article is mentioned), Question 3 suggest that expansion of agriculture is favored at the expense of pastoralism. This suggests lack of implementing regulations to operationalize the spirit of the constitution.

*Evidence B:* The indigenous knowledge system of Gada is well recognized and supported as meaningful in sustainable resource management and general governance.

### 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: 3/3*

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

*Evidence A:* Evidenced by the Constitution, Ethiopias' legal and policy framework support IPLC-led conservation initiatives. For example, provincial legislation recognize rights of communities under the Participatory Forest Management System.

*Evidence B:* National and local governments have specific programs that support sustainable use and management of the 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:* 1/3

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* The Gada system is touted as being an excellent IPLC-lead conservation initiative. Another is the pastoral land certification programs, both of which are relevant to the proposed project.

*Evidence B:* There is mention of international NGOs working in the area supporting similar initiatives. But this is not clearly elaborated.

## 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:* 1/3

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A:* Two programs are mentioned namely the conservation of sacred sites and the conservation of rangelands. Financed by the Christensen Fund and the Swiss Church aid respectively, these initiatives are highly complementary to the proposed project.

*Evidence B:* The EOI mentions a number of partners that seem to provide complementary support to the project. This means that there exists some synergy between them.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 143 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:* Based on a clear and succinct articulation of the communities' vision, the EOI is explicit on twin objectives of ICI. For example, the IPLC traditional governance structures are envisioned to be the conduit for project implementation.

*Evidence B:* The EOI's proposed approach to utilize indigenous methods of resource management governance and knowledge systems of Borana pastoralists seems to hold the promise that it will deliver the desired results.

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:* Activities are convincingly robust. However, one aspect requires more clarification, namely the proposed idea of reducing "free grazing". Specifically, this should not be intrusive/disruptive to the traditional livelihood.

*Evidence B:* The activities are well listed but the time lines are not so well articulated. This makes it difficult to tell when different activities are to take place.

### 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:* The proposed activities are realistic and sufficiently ambitious. For example the EOI envisages to put more than 87,000 hectares of forest and rangelands under the community.

*Evidence B:* The use of the indigenous Gada system where all community members have specific roles to play makes ownership easy and accomplishment of agreed plans realizable.

### 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:* The activities are realistic and can be achieved within the proposed time and budget. This may be partly because the EOI does not aim at reforming the legal and policy framework but instead aims at raising awareness on the implementation of existing ones.

*Evidence B:* Yes they are achievable. The lack of time frame for various activities makes it difficult to decide when each activity is to be achieved.

### 5. Does the Eol 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:* The EOI makes reference to community's in-kind contribution as well as two on going projects financed by the Christensen Fund and the Swiss Church Aid respectively. However, when juxtaposed with the proposed activities, these sources are only moderate.

*Evidence B:* Some two donors are mentioned but their actual contributions is not.

## 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: 1/5 Reviewer B: 3/5*

**Average: 2/5**

*Evidence A:* The EOI is explicit that the proposed project will contribute to enhancement of 87,105 hectares. Based on the scoring suggestions above this is a very low contribution.

*Evidence B:* There is mention of Climate resilient Green Economy Strategy and Action Plan with a number of components that seem to be aligned with Global Environmental Benefits.

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:* The EOI is weak in linking cultural and livelihood results' contribution to project objectives. Instead it lists mainstream monitoring and evaluation benchmarks.

*Evidence B:* There is mention of young men accepting to take up positions within the Gada system, This means that their participation will contribute to the realization of the proposed objectives.

## 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:* The EOI proposes to integrate the project with the government's on going similar initiatives as well as to incentives on the part of the communities. These provide medium vision for sustainability.

*Evidence B:* This project has a potential for long term sustainability essentially because of the plan to make it inclusive all community members through their indigenous knowledge system.

## 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 interlinked with the national priorities as defined in the NBSAP and the NDC. For example, it refers to biodiversity protection and management for food security as well as health and livelihood improvement for Ethiopian people.

*Evidence B:* Working closely with the national and local governments ensures that it observes the necessary protocols.

## 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:* Historical injustices afflicting women are clearly articulated, with strategies for addressing them spanning inclusion in decision making bodies. This suggests a well thought-out approach.

*Evidence B:* The EOI seems to be aware of the depressed position of women in traditional society and have plans to rectify it.

## 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:* The proposed activities showcase innovation in addressing both ecological and social challenges that threaten conservation and IPLC leadership and stewardship. They include economic empowerment and regulated access to common resources.

*Evidence B:* The use of indigenous institutions in the implementation of the project is innovative and has potential for transformative results.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 31/40

Average Total Score: 29/40

Performance of Eol 143 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:* Based on an overall reading of the EOI, it appears the applicant organization is an IPLC NGO. Accordingly, the EOI will be lead by the IPLC not only as beneficiaries but also through inclusion in decision making positions.

*Evidence B:* There are Indigenous people in the project but it is said that their capacity needs improvement. The project has plans to carry out some training activities for this purpose.

### 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 lead proponent has over 20 years experience working among the IPLC. There is no doubt it has extensive experiences on natural resources management and biodiversity conservation, to name a few.

*Evidence B:* Some but not all. See above.

### 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: 3/5 Reviewer B: 2/5*

**Average: 2.5/5**

*Evidence A:* While only one IPLC partner is mentioned in the EOI, the role is clearly defined as an implementing partner.

*Evidence B:* It is not clear what roles Indigenous peoples will play in the day to day implementation of the project. However, since the executive director is indigenous, it is possible that the role of indigenous people will be clarified during the implementation.

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: 4/5*

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The lead proponent as well as the implementing partners have a combined experience of close to 40 years. However, none of them has GEF Project experience.

*Evidence B:* There seems to be awareness of what needs to be done and how. However, knowledge of GEF experience is not mentioned.

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: 2/6*

**Average: 4/6**

*Evidence A:* The organization's annual budget is 367,000\$ and has more than 3 sources of income whereas no one sources provides more than 60%. This is demonstrably strong.

*Evidence B:* The EOI demonstrates many good ideas that are useful for the project. But it is apparent that it needs assistance clarifying some aspects of the proposed project.

## 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: NA/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* The lead proponent has implemented projects involving safeguards. They include those supported by DFID and EU

*Evidence B:* It is not mentioned.

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 23/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 14/30

Average Total Score: 18.5/30

Performance of Eol 143 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

