

# Eol Reviews by TRC


## Assessment of Eol: 269

Organization: Indonesia Locally Marine Managed Area Foundation

### Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Sam Johnston	269	Melanesia	Indonesia	27	40	25	92
Eleanor Dictaan - Bang-oa	269	Melanesia	Indonesia	21	30	20	71

Performance of Eol 269 in Melanesia - 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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* The proposed landscape as the Coral Triangle in Southeast Asia has the highest diversity of coral reef fish in the world.

*Evidence B:* The area is located in the Indonesian side of the Coral Triangle - a globally important KBA with several confirmed IBAs and high RSR and prioritized by the government for marine conservation . It is home to IPLCs ( not identified in the proposal ) and will cover 9 Islands and a bay area in 3 provinces i.e Papua, Maluku and North Maluku..

2. Is the area important for climate mitigation?

Scoring:

- >50 t/ha - Low;
- 50 - 100 t/ha - Moderate;
- >100 t/ha - High

*Reviewer A: 2/2 Reviewer B: 2/2*

**Average: 2/2**

*Evidence A:* Indeed, the online scoring tool map depicts a rate > 150 t/ha, which shows that the area is highly important for climate mitigation.

*Evidence B:* Based on the SSR, a vast area of the project site are classified as storing high irrecoverable carbon although no specific data has been accessed. This includes forests, peat lands and mangrove forests.

### 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 EoI presents a combination of laws that recognise community ownership of land and sea ecosystems, and the traditional ways of stewarding resources. According to CI database (Too-Big to Ignore), there is a basis for co-management/governance of fisheries with IPLCs in Indonesia, although further details are unavailable.

*Evidence B:* IPLCs governance over project site is evident as described in practice in the proposal. SSR data, however, points to challenges of formal recognition in Maluku and North Maluku as compared to Papua where there is a special autonomy law that recognized IPLC lands. Non-formal recognition is a significant constraint as this impacts on the extent of IPLC access, use and management of lands and resources, including matters of sustaining conservation.

### 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:* NA

*Evidence B:* Proposal describes the culturally embedded land and resource management and governance system and cites its importance in resource conservation and management. It however fails to identify the IPLCs in the area or provide an idea of their number.

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

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A:* The EoI thoroughly describes the conditions that are pushing locals to exploit the natural resources of the area and threatening sustainability. Exploitative fishing practices, as well as plastic pollution, coastal development and habitat alterations are threats described in the EoI as the cause of the reduced ecosystem's productivity.

*Evidence B:* There are internal and external threats associated with economic activities i.e destructive fishing, overexploitation, tourism, cited in the proposal. The SSR points to some forest loss and increasing forest reduction from 2000-2016 exacerbated by impacts of climate change and low capacities for management.

**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: 2/3*

**Average: 2/3**

*Evidence A:* Despite the long-standing efforts to overcome territorial tensions, and foster participatory and equitable natural resources management, insecure land tenure remains a driver of conflict in Indonesia. Conflict over marine territory is also a complex issue due to the lack of documentation, mapping of areas, identification of resources and further conservation activities.

*Evidence B:* Papua's special autonomy law provides strong legal and policy framework for recognition of IPLC rights over their territories. The state constitution and other policies, if efficiently understood and used as a community, can also be tapped as entry points enabling current local management initiatives (as per project experience by proponent) for the 2 other provinces, by communities and CSOs/NGOs. Conflicting policies, however, may be juxtaposed to these enablers in looking at longer term transformative impacts.

**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: NA*

*Evidence B:* National government seems to recognize IPLC led conservation but with very minimal has been actualized on the ground. Much of the little progress on these regard are initiatives from IPLCs/ CSO's with support of subnational governments.

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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* The proposed project is a continuation of an earlier initiative aiming to broaden its scope while building on the achievements from the past project. There are also other existing projects of the same nature in the area.

### 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: NA*

*Evidence B:* There are 4 existing initiatives in the area complimentary to resource conservation and management. There is only one that is directly supporting IPLC-led conservation.




Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 24/30

Performance of Eol 269 in Melanesia - 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:*strengthening local governance systems in rspnse to threats while addressing livelihoods and ecosystems integrity is well aligned to the ICI objective.

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: NA*

*Evidence B:*The project has clear objectives and well-defined and measurable targets and 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: NA*

*Evidence B:* defined activities are seen to facilitate and contribute to IPLC led responses against identified threats. How to manage setting up 150 new LMMAs while strengthening 125 existing others, however, needs to be clearly defined in detailed workplan.

#### 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* Given the bigger scope, proponent projects a 400,00 USD annual budget for this project based on a USD 100,000 annual budget from a previous project. This is well within the ICI's budget ceiling.

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

*Scoring:*

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* There are 3 other existing projects in the area and other initiatives at the national /subnational level focused on conservation. There are, however, very limited ( i.e 1/3) initiatives in direct support to IPLCs .

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

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* Although the EoI lacks specific data regarding the total amount of hectares under improved management, additional calculations referred in the EoI indicate the project ranks Very High.

*Evidence B:* Project envisions to strengthen conservation of 1 million hectares marine and coastal ecosystems LMMAs.

**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: NA/3*

**Average: 3/3**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* Indicators provided are those from the activities.

**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: NA*

*Evidence B:* Legal pluralism approach to resource conservation, management and governance provides scope for long term benefits. This can be appreciated and strengthened more when explicitly linked to the realization of rights by the IPLCs.

### 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* Proposal is very general in this item though partially addressed in Section 1. This can be developed further to demonstrate how it can specifically contribute or how it relates to the NBSAP and/or the NDCs.

### 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: 2/3*

**Average: 2.5/3**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* Acknowledgement of different gender and generational roles and specific women and workgroups cited as part of working methods. These should translate into the development of project workplan and budget and its actualization in the outcomes/results.

### 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: 4/5*

**Average: 4.5/5**

*Evidence A:* NA

*Evidence B:* LMMA is an approach and a tool which can be adopted for upscaling This proposal is somehow an initiative to upscale the earlier initiative. It has a high potential for cascading to other communities within the whole landscape, if benefits are directly acknowledged and realized by communities involved.


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 40/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 30/40

Average Total Score: 35/40

Performance of Eol 269 in Melanesia - 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: 2/6 Reviewer B: 2/6*

**Average: 2/6**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* Proponent claims to be IPLC but does not elaborate further nor have it mentioned the diverse IPLCs/ ethnicities within the target communities.

### 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: 4/6*

**Average: 5/6**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* The proponent has been working in the area for 18 years with locally based staff. With their technical expertise and their previous experience with LMMAs informs their capacity to lead the proposed work.

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

**Average: 4/5**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:* These are in varying degrees in two levels of action : 1) the proponent considers itself as an IP organization, therefore, there is an assumed effective integration of IP perspectives into project design and governance as may be evident in some parts of the proposal. 2) At the partnership level, it includes “20 IPLC organizations in Papua and Maluku...” only with clear roles in implementation but not in project design and governance. The proposal can benefit from more elaboration on how they will approach the work with IPLCs in North Maluku and explicitly clarify how it can further address effective IP participation in overall project design and governance aside from it being a result of the activities.

#### 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: NA*

*Evidence B:* Proponent implemented a 2 year project amounting to USD 303,387 under USAID which may suffice in terms of familiarity with technical, financial and administrative capacities required.

#### 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: NA*

*Evidence B:*Lead proponent has 5 diverse funding sources with an average annual budget of U D 400,000subjecttoannualexternalauditandhasrecentlyimplementedaU D 303,387 worth 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: 1/2*

**Average: 1.5/2**

*Evidence A: NA*

*Evidence B:*Lead organization's experience is with an international donor ( USAID) where there may be similar safeguards and standards which it complied with but not the GEF itself.



Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 25/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 20/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 269 in Melanesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

