



Economics of Land Degradation (ELD) initiative

Call for proposals for new case studies

This is a call for proposals for new case studies to be commissioned by the ELD initiative (<http://eld-initiative.org/>).

Who can apply

The call for proposal is open to all involved in the economics of land degradation and/or sustainable land management.

Evaluation procedure

The evaluation of proposals will be carried out by the Scientific Coordinator of the Initiative, the three Working Group Leaders, and the ELD Secretariat. Funding allocation will be decided by the ELD Political Partners on an on-going basis. The ELD is a global initiative and the final selection of proposals will cover several regions of the World. The ELD initiative is funded until May 2014, by when its three targeted output reports should be produced. Proposals submitted for funding of case studies should therefore be designed to ensure results are available before the end of 2013.

Proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- (a) scientific quality and "value for money";
- (b) use of top-down or bottom-up approaches or innovative aspects of both;
- (c) use of non-market valuations as well as market valuations;
- (d) potential for integration of results across scales;
- (e) consideration of land rehabilitation, prevention of land degradation and alternative livelihoods for action;
- (f) capacity to involve and/or reach out to a range of audiences (scientific community, decision-makers, private sector);

- (g) selected location(s) is (are) representative of its (their) specific region(s) of the World;
- (h) addresses one or more of the identified gaps (list in annex of this document);
- (i) well-defined time plan and adequate proposed budget.

How to apply

Proposals should be submitted in English and less than 3,000 words long. Proposals for one or several countries/regions of the world may be submitted. Submitted budget should be in the range of 100,000-200,000 Euro. Special consideration will be given to projects with a larger budget depending on their "value for money" (scale, number of partners,...).

Applications consist of:

- (1) a description of the proposed case study detailing the study context and objectives, ELD gap to be addressed (see annex), country(ies) and World region(s), proposed method(s), activities, expected results/outputs;
- (2) a presentation of the applicant or group of applicants (no more than 1,000 characters including spaces);
- (3) a time plan (proposed case studies should be completed before the end of 2013);
- (4) a detailed activity budget.

Proposals should be sent to Richard Thomas (Richard.Thomas@unu.edu) and Emmanuelle Quillérou (Emmanuelle.Quillerou@unu.edu) with a copy to Mark Schauer of the ELD Secretariat (Mark.Schauer@giz.de) and Lucie Andeltova (Lucie.Andeltova@giz.de) before **March 31st 2013**.

Notifications of successful proposals will be sent by the ELD Secretariat in due course after decision by the ELD Political Partners.

(next page: Annex List of gaps to be addressed)

Annex: List of gaps to be addressed:

Technological

1. Overall costs/benefits of different land management interventions (trade offs with focus on livestock and rangelands)
2. Understanding of drivers of changes (case studies)
3. Relationship between population density and land degradation
4. Identify system tipping points for land degradation

Environmental evaluation

5. Lack of harmonized methodology (scales, discount rate)
6. Lack of information on social costs of land degradation
7. Lack of information on mapping ecosystem services
8. Lack of information on non-market values of ecosystem services
9. Lack of robust low cost methods applicable by affected countries in short term
10. Limited understanding of value of ecosystem services to local livelihoods

Policy gaps

11. Lack of plausible scenarios
12. Lack of monitoring and evaluation for total ecosystem assessments
13. How can policies promote sustainable land management

Institutional and private sector

14. Lack of incentives for sustainable land management
15. Greater interdisciplinary approaches (incentives)
16. Lack of knowledge management