Ethiopian Diaspora Trust Fund

EDTF Call for Project Proposals and Project Review Processes: Overview
Developing the EDTF Call for Project Proposal

Objectives:
- Shape the EDTF priority areas
- Validate project selection criteria
- Create awareness about the grant system.

Visit to regions
EDTF donors/contributors survey
Consultative workshop with diverse stakeholders
Developing the EDTF Call for Project Proposal

Documents prepared

1. EDTF project selection criteria
2. Guideline for applicants
3. Standard Application form
4. Results Framework template
5. Key milestones template
6. Budget proposal template
7. Applicant Profile _ management staff template
8. Applicant Profile _ technical staff template
9. Applicant Profile _ key administration and finance staff template
10. Declaration of honor form
11. Applicant’s checklist
12. EDTF Call for project proposals - Indicative timetable
13. EDTF Project implementation agreement
An orientation session was organized to explain the project submission procedures and process.
The EDTF Call for Projects: launching

- The first EDTF Call for Project Proposals was announced on 25 July 2019

- The call was announced via
  - Press conference attended by local and international media
  - Press release circulated to local and international media
  - Local Amharic and English News paper advertisements
  - Email circulation to more than 400 local NGOs and the Ethiopian Chamber of Commerce
  - CCRDA website and other popular grant tracking websites
The EDTF Call for Projects: Follow up & Communication

Dedicated e-mail account and telephone number for potential applicants to request and receive information

100+ emails
150+ phone calls

Response to frequently asked questions on EDTF website projects page

The project submission status was announced via:

Press release
EDTF website
Bulk e-mail to potential applicants
EDTF project submission was closed on 16 September 2019

- 508 projects were submitted in hand delivery and by e-mail
- 410 projects were submitted online
- 98 projects were submitted after the deadline – thus, excluded from any further process
- After due diligence check 242 projects were found to be complete and eligible for review.
- 242 Projects reviewed
The EDTF Project Review Process

Documents developed for project review

- Terms of reference for Project review team
- Project review scoring templates
- Guidance note for reviewers
The EDTF Project Review: Process

Step 1: Technical review of projects
- Combined score of 75 points required

Step 2: Assessment of institutional capacity
- Out of 60 points
- Combined score of at least 40 points required

Step 3: Assessment of budget proposal
- Out of 40 points

A three-step review process

The quality threshold: 150 points
Mobilization and Engagement of Project Reviewers:

- 100% of the project review exercise up to this stage conducted by volunteers
- 116 volunteers were mobilized as potential candidates
- 88 volunteers were screened as suitable candidates and approved by BoD
- 10 dropped out before starting the review
- 78 engaged in the review of process
- 77 successfully completed the process
- 1 failed to deliver review result
The EDTF Project Review: Process

- 26 Project review team were formed with 3 members each
- 26 Orientation meeting with each review team
- Each project proposal was reviewed by 3 people (with the exception of one team)
- Each review team reviewed 6 – 13 project proposals
- Continuous e-mail and telephone communication and follow up with the review team
The EDTF Project Review:

Financial Worth of Contribution by EDTF Volunteers

- By a minimum estimate of 2 days spent in reviewing one project proposal:
  - 1,432 man-days were dedicated by volunteers to EDTF project review
  - By an average local consult fee of 300 USD per day the financial worth of the work contributed by volunteers is 429,600 USD or ca. 13,300,000 ET Birr
The EDTF Project Review: Process

**Challenges**

- Difficult and time taking to mobilize suitable volunteers
- Document transfer system: large volume files
- Team coordination (due to geographic location and time difference)
- Change/shift of commitment by few reviewers
- Institutional capacity review was only document-based due to large number of projects
- Delay due to few PRT members
The EDTF Project Review: Results

- 242 projects reviewed
- 67 projects met the EDTF quality threshold of 150 average points or above
### Sectoral Distribution of Top 21 Projects – Unadjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>No of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Children, Youth and Women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, health, water and sanitation sector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food income nutrition security and youth employment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP/Agri-business/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP/WASH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste management/Income generation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste management/Income generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP/WASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP/Agri-business/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food income nutrition security and youth employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, health, water and sanitation sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Children, Youth and Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Distribution of Top 21 Projects: Unadjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrari</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Abeba, Oromia, SNNPR, Amhara,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia and Amhara</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia, SNNPR Amhara</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sectoral Distribution of Top 21 Projects: After Regional Equity Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP/Agri-business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, income nutrition, security and youth employment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation and water supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste management/Income generation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP/WASH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; Youth &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Sectoral Distribution of Projects](attachment:sectoral_distribution.png)
Sectoral Distribution of Top 21 Projects: After Regional Equity Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Abeba, Oromia, SNNPR, Amhara, Tigray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar and Tigray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara, SNNPR and Oromia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benishangul Gumuz</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dire Dawa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambell, Afar, Benshangule Gumuz</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison: Sectoral Distribution

Before regional equality adjustment

- Women Employment
- Technology and Innovation
- Solid waste management/Income generation
- Sanitation
- IDP/WASH
- IDP/Agri-business/
- Health and Education
- Food income nutrition security and youth...
- Education, health, water and sanitation sector
- Services for Children, Youth and Women
- Child protection
- Water and sanitation
- Education

After regional equality adjustment

- WOMEN EMPLOYMENT
- WOMEN & YOUTH & REHABILITATION
- IDP/WASH
- SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT/INCOME GENERATION
- SANITATION
- IRRIGATION AND WATER SUPPLY
- HEALTH
- HEALTH AND EDUCATION
- FOOD INCOME NUTRITION SECURITY AND YOUTH...
- CHILD PROTECTION
- AGRICULTURE
- IDP/AGRI-BUSINESS
- WATER SANITATION AND HYGIENE
- EDUCATION

Values:
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
Comparison: Regional Distribution

Before Regional Equity Adjustment

- OROMIA, SNNPR AMHARA: 1
- OROMIA AND AMHARA: 1
- ADDIS ABEBA, OROMIA, SNNPR, AMHARA, SNNPR: 1
- HARRARI: 1
- AFAR: 1
- ADDIS ABABA: 3
- OROMIA: 5
- AMHARA: 7

After Regional Equity Adjustment

- TIGRAY: 1
- SNPR: 1
- HARRAR: 1
- GAMBER, AFAR, BENSANGLA GUMUZ: 1
- DIRE DAWA: 1
- BENSHAGUL GUMUZ: 1
- AMHARA, SNNPR AND OROMIA: 1
- AFAR AND TIGRAY: 1
- AFAR: 1
- ADDIS ABEBA, OROMIA, SNNPR, AMHARA, TIGRAY: 3
- ADDIS ABABA: 4
- OROMIA: 4
- AMHARA: 4

Before Regional Equity Adjustment:
- OROMIA, SNNPR AMHARA
- OROMIA AND AMHARA
- ADDIS ABEBA, OROMIA, SNNPR, AMHARA, SNNPR
- HARRARI
- AFAR
- ADDIS ABABA
- OROMIA
- AMHARA

After Regional Equity Adjustment:
- TIGRAY
- SNPR
- HARRAR
- GAMBER, AFAR, BENSANGLA GUMUZ
- DIRE DAWA
- BENSHAGUL GUMUZ
- AMHARA, SNNPR AND OROMIA
- AFAR AND TIGRAY
- AFAR
- ADDIS ABEBA, OROMIA, SNNPR, AMHARA, TIGRAY
- ADDIS ABABA
- OROMIA
- AMHARA
Observations and Recommendations from Review Teams

▪ General quality of many project proposals was poor
▪ The majority of project proposals submitted may not result in sustainable solutions
▪ Sustainability of project results and benefits is a general concern
▪ EDTF should consider clear focus on few high impact and visible areas and flagship projects
▪ Training for applicants in project proposal preparation and project development is needed
Next Steps

▪ Approval of shortlisted projects by the EDTF Board of Directors
▪ Announcement of shortlisted projects
▪ Commissioning of institutional capacity and budget review
▪ Selection of 15 or 16 projects based on the results of the review
  (UNDP has finalized the review and will announce the results on Monday or Tuesday)
▪ Signing Implementation agreement with the selected grantees
▪ Disbursing first instalment of grant
▪ Follow up, monitoring and evaluation
Issus that Require Guidance and Decision from the Board of Directors

1. The issue of Somali region projects not meeting the quality threshold

   Including Somali in the shortlist in consideration of
   - One of the regions with the highest diaspora abroad and remittance
   - An emerging region
   - The only region excluded

   Vs.
   Adhering to the official project eligibility and selection procedure

2. Possibility of more regions being excluded based on the result of the upcoming organizational capacity and budget review. Do we still go for regional equity or merit?
Thank you for your attention