

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 155

Organization: Ujamaa Community Resource Team(UCRT) Tanzania

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Sinegugu Zukulu	155	East Africa Drylands	Tanzania	26	38	28	92
Leo van der Vlist	155	East Africa Drylands	Tanzania	26	39	30	95

Performance of Eol 155 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score



Section 1 - Experience & strengths relevant to the proposed Indigenous territory, landscape/seascape (Total Points: 30)

A) Importance of the landscape/seascape/indigenous territory for biodiversity, with additional consideration to climate benefits.

1. Is the proposed territory/landscape/seascape a globally important area for biodiversity?

Scoring:

- Not significant;
- Low Significance;
- Moderate Significance;
- Medium-high Significance;
- High Significance;
- Exceptional Significance

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

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The region has high species rarity. and is also a Key biodiversity area of Northern Tanzania.

Evidence B: Broadly speaking, the project area extends across critical areas of rangeland connectivity south and east of the greater Serengeti – Ngorongoro and make up the northern and southern most extents of the Tarangire – Manyara ecosystems in Northern Tanzania. This area is most known for its extensive wildlife migrations including over 4,000 elephants and around 20,000 zebra and 20,000 wildebeest. The area maintains several diverse ecological features, including three large soda lakes, afro-montane forests atop Great Rift valley volcanic mountains, short grass plains and seasonal wetlands, dense woodlands and acacia forests, and riverine systems. Lake Natron is a designated RAMSAR site and is the primary breeding ground for lesser flamingo. This area includes several KBA's, has a very high Species Range-Size Rarity, but is not an Intact Forest Landscape.

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: It is a very critical ecosystem for Pastoralists in the region. It is an important carbon storage area.

Evidence B: The area scores low to moderate 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The area is unde4r recognized IPLC areas.

Evidence B: The entire area is identified as Indicative Areas of Indigenous and Community Land Rights. Roughly 80 percent of all wildlife habitat in the Northern Tanzania landscape is held as community lands by indigenous peoples. Over the years, pastoralists and hunter-gatherers have lost their land due to immigration, agricultural expansion, and protected areas that exclude or displace people. With the Maasai, decisions of land and natural resources governance were historically made by traditional Laigwanak elders. With the Tanzanian government's establishment of formal administrative villages, wards, and districts, traditional systems of governance were undermined to an extent, but continue to remain influential in decisions of land use and grazing, and particularly in the resolution of conflicts. The Hadzabe and Akie hunter-gatherer communities were largely marginalized as a result of formal village administration structures, but they now have explicitly designated communal land reserved for hunting and gathering based on Land Use Plans (LUPs) and communal Certificates of Customary Rights of Occupancy (CCROs). Iraqw have more fully adopted modern governance structures in decision making, with lesser influence of historical traditional leadership structures.

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 people of the region are Pastoralists who dependent on natural resources and grazing. this is clearly evident in the application.

Evidence B: For the hunter-gatherers like the Hadzabe and Akie, the area means maintaining access to water, wild fruits, tubers and roots, honey, and wildlife. For pastoralists such as the Maasai, Datoga, and Iraqw, this means pasture first and foremost, as well as salt licks, water, and forest products such as fuel wood and medicinal plants. Separate from livelihoods, these lands hold deep cultural significant for people that, for centuries, have been tied to places, including sacred forests and mountains such as the Oldonyo lengai mountain of God.

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: 5/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The planned work is highly significant and needs urgent attention if we are to ensure IPLC have access to good grazing. This will also stop the desertification in the region.

Evidence B: Climate change and population growth, coupled with economic development, puts tremendous pressure on natural resources and ecosystem services. These drivers exacerbate the main threats to biodiversity and indigenous communities, which are agricultural expansion, rangeland degradation through overgrazing, deforestation, and other unsustainable practices, including introduction of invasive species. Additional, but important contributing factors to the above threats are inadequate tenure security for communal lands and poor governance support for collective community action and discouragement of individually motivated practices. These leave community lands very vulnerable to external land grabbing. Low investment in new and existing livelihood options that derive value from nature lead to poor resource use, while 70 percent of households experience food insecurity including 34 percent that experience severe food insecurity. The area has very high Cumulative Development Pressure, Some forest loss from 2000-2019, 2 large neighbouring land deals. 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: The legislative Framework in Tanzania is excellent. All what is needed is implementation which is what this project will do.

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). Tanzania laws and legislation provide opportunities that support proposed activities in relation to the land tenure and land use planning, governance and natural resource management. The land policy reforms of the 1990s resulted in two laws, the Land Act Act N0.4 1999 and the Village Land Act N0.5 1999, both formally strengthening the rights of communities. This legislation recognizes the right of local and indigenous communities to use and manage their land and natural resources. However, for this to happen, villages must be demarcated, with clear boundaries and clear land tenure security as evidenced by the issuance of a Certificate of Village Land (CVL). After villages are secured and have a CVL, the communities then focus on sustainable management, through the Land Use Planning Act 2007 which stipulates steps whereby villages, through Village Councils, define different uses of land within the village.

7. Is there active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the proposed country/area?

Scoring:

- National or sub-national governments are actively opposed to IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have recognized the importance of IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments have implemented some support for IPLC-led conservation;
- National or sub-national governments are actively engaged in the promotion of IPLC rights and IPLC-led conservation

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: All spheres of government are promoting and in support of IPLC governance and implementation of policies.

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). This project has written support letters from local governments involved.

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: It is very clear the work of this organization is excellent and benefiting local IPLC.

Evidence B: The project builds on existing IPLC conservation initiatives facilitated by UCRT, which broadly reflect a three-step community led approach: first, formally securing land and resource rights and planning land use; second, establishing and building capacity of local institutions to manage resources; and third, developing nature-based incentives that promote human wellbeing in support of long-term conservation outcomes.

E) Synergies with existing investments.

9. Are there other initiatives (relevant projects) that provide complementary support for IPLC-led conservation in the geography?

Scoring:

- Few to no complementary projects/investment;
- Complementary projects/investments are small, or are tangentially related to project goals;
- Complementary Projects/investments align strongly with project goals and investments are substantial

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

Average: 2/2

Evidence A: Both past and current work programme of UCRT and other partners is complementary in this regard.

Evidence B: The EoI lists 3 relevant projects with large donors that could bring co-financing and mentions several other, related projects and mentions substantial in-kind contributions from both communities and governments.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 26/30

Average Total Score: 26/30

Performance of Eol 155 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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: This speaks directly to SDGs.

Evidence B: This proposal aims to ensure that in five years, indigenous governance structures within the three clusters will sustainably manage communal land and natural resources and that connected rangelands will be able to support healthy numbers of people, livestock, and wildlife. The EoI describes very clearly and convincing how the outcomes and activity groups will achieve this and UCRT already has a lot of experience with this type of work, as well as established community and government relations.

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: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: Very clear and articulate plan of action. Implementable activities that will yield sustainable results.

Evidence B: Three very clear, relevant and interconnected outcomes each well substantiated with a set of relevant activities.

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 relevant plan to local challenges of natural resource management by Paastoralists in this region.

Evidence B: The activities clearly address the threats and builds on enabling conditions potential and previous experience and work with the communities and governments.

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: 3/3 Reviewer B: 3/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: This application speaks directly to what GEF funding wants to achieve in the support for indigenous people. It speaks to climate change, sustainability and conservation of natural resources.

Evidence B: The Eol includes a tentative budget for the activities that is based on previous experiences and is well within the budget range.

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: This is building on and sustaining some of the work already done on the landscape and also increase to other areas.

*Evidence B:*yes, also explained in section 1.

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:* 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: It does very well.

*Evidence B:*Estimated total area under improved management is 940,000 ha.

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: This supports the current culture and life style of the local indigenous people. It enhances their way of life and empowers them to face care of the land in the face of increasing population pressure on the land.

*Evidence B:*The EoI lists clear livelihood and cultural benefits: Value of products or revenues generated by households and communities from nature-based economic activities supported directly by the project (disaggregated by revenue source, e.g., carbon, tourism, beekeeping, and savings held by credit groups). Number of villages with improved governance scores, including demonstrated improvement in representation and inclusion of women, youth, and traditional leaders in participatory processes, and decision-making, based on a village governance assessment tool. Number of community institutions with improved natural resource management capacity as a result of project activities (disaggregated by type, e.g., Village Council, Ward Grazing Committee, WRLF).

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: Very clearly and tangible results. It is about the people on the ground. Is about giving them capacity to bring about the changes that would benefit them directly. There is no doubt that the planned strategy will be successful.

Evidence B: The targeted communities (Akie, Datoga, Hadzabe, Irawq, and Maasai) will be equipped with knowledge and skills to ensure sustainable use, management, and benefit of land and natural resources in the legal context of Tanzania. UCRT will ensure that communities are fully engaged in all aspects of the project as well as in some implementation activities ensuring community project ownership. Equipped with knowledge, skills and ownership, it is very likely that communities will continue to protect their land and natural resources long after the project.

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: It is well aligned with both national and local policy frameworks.

Evidence B: The EoI clearly explains to which elements of the NBSAPs and NDCs of Tanzania the project will contribute.

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: Gender mainstreaming is a very difficult terrain to navigate in this region but the planned approach will ensure a move towards gender mainstreaming.

Evidence B: The EoI states that the project will ensure that gender-related concerns are fully accounted for in the project design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. It is very well substantiated 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: These planned activities could be done successfully in any Pastoralists community facing similar challenges anywhere in the world.

Evidence B: The project is well founded on experience, opportunities and good relations with both communities and governmental institutions and fully focuses on IPLC-led conservation with great emphasis on IPLC capacity building and ownership. The scale of 36 villages is significant.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 38/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 39/40

Average Total Score: 38.5/40

Performance of Eol 155 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: IPLCS are well recognized in Tanzania, than in other neighboring countries in the region.

Evidence B: UCRT was established 20 years ago and is a leading indigenous organization in Tanzania specializing in securing and governing land of indigenous people.

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: 6/6 Reviewer B: 6/6

Average: 6/6

Evidence A: The work already done on the landscape speaks for itself. The UCRT work is working well with IPLCS here.

Evidence B: The organization has one or more IPLC-led projects but these are directed from its base in an urban centre. The organisation coordinates at least one network of local IPLC organizations, community-based organizations or other civil society groups, which is active in one or more regions of the country. UCRT has championed local land rights for indigenous groups, who have, with UCRT's efforts, secured 800,000 hectares of land through the CCRO legal mechanism. UCRT's success was recognized as early as 2008, when the United Nations Development Programme selected UCRT to receive the prestigious Equator Prize in recognition of contributions to conservation and development in Tanzania. Then in 2016, Edward Loure was awarded the Goldman Environmental Prize for achievements and leadership of UCRTs grassroots environmental activism.

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 5/5

Average: 5/5

Evidence A: The work done previously and currently supports this.

Evidence B: UCRT itself coordinates a network of local IPLC organizations and all field staff come from the communities with whom they work. UCRT has listed a local IPLC organization as partner with a clear role. UCRT is recognized as a grassroots Indigenous organisation, whose work is firmly rooted in community processes of self-determination and organising. This proposal responds to the self-determined priorities of Indigenous peoples in northern Tanzania and provides a platform for realising their collective visions for the future of their territories and areas.

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 previous work done and Awards won by the UCRT team are a good testimony.

*Evidence B:*All the proposed program coordinators have worked for UCRT for more than 10 years and several of them are founding members of the organization. All field staff come from the communities with whom they work. All staff working in the field have experience in conflict resolution, land use planning, tenure security, and natural resource management for the targeted pastoralist, agro-pastoralist and hunter- gatherer communities. Field staff have experience in community development, gender diversification, forestry and rangeland management, Geographic Information Systems, project planning and management, legal and governance expertise, and financial managements. UCRT works very closely with leading conservation and development organizations who provide additional skills and expertise. UCRT's policies have been accepted for managing funding from bilateral agencies (e.g., USAID funds through TNC and DFID funds through VSF and African Initiatives) as well as from the GEF Small Grants Programme (e.g., UCRT managed a project through UNDP to support EECDI).

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: They have demonstrated excellent financial management.

*Evidence B:*The average annual budget (USD) of the organization is USD 1,541,397 and has at least two project over 200,000, *the largest being US* 1,292,105. 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.

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: UCRT seems to be really good in this kind of work.

*Evidence B:*UCRT's policies have been accepted for managing funding from bilateral agencies (e.g., USAID funds through TNC and DFID funds through VSF and African Initiatives) as well as from the GEF Small Grants Programme (e.g., UCRT managed a project through UNDP to support EECDI).

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 28/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/30

Average Total Score: 29/30

Performance of Eol 155 in East Africa Drylands - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

