

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 370

Organization: Rimbawan Muda Indonesia

Eol Metadata

Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
370	South East Asia (Islands)	Indonesia	29	34	24	87
370	South East Asia (Islands)	Indonesia	21	27	22	70

Performance of Eol 370 in South East Asia (Islands) - 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 location is home to species rarity (61% of the species in Sulawesi island), covering by an intact forest landscape, and including in the key biodiversity area.

Evidence B: Globally significant across the island (Sulawesi)

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: 1/2

Average: 1.5/2

Evidence A: The applicant does not provide information about potential carbon stock, but geospatial data indicates that the proposed location is surrounded by high carbon density.

Evidence B: Average across area covered

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: 3/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: The proposed location is maintained by strong and active customary institutions. Geospatial data also indicated that the proposed areas are surrounded by IPLCs' territory.

Evidence B: Significant constraints as the extent of tenure is unclear - and large National Parks with limited access. Strong institutions continue to exist

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 proposed project clearly indicated the significance of the proposed location for cultural and local livelihoods.

Evidence B: yes

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: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The applicant has indicated some crucial threats in the proposed location including restriction from the national park officers, mining and plantation concessions, illegal logging and hunting, power generator project and monoculture development.

Evidence B: complex, differentiated threats, mining, agriculture, conservation policies, population increases, centralised agricultural planning

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The government at different level have enacted regulations to support IPLC-led conservation and recognition of customary land rights in Sulawesi.

Evidence B: Recognise limited rights, but genuine policy opportunities are described

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The government at different level have enacted regulations to support IPLC-led conservation and recognition of customary land rights in Sulawesi.

Evidence B: Localised support and opening of opportunities under decentralised rule in Indonesia

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The applicant explained that some indigenous groups have obtained legal recognition from the district government for their cultural practice in natural resource management.

Evidence B: Well described in the proposal, in specific locations (scale still small)

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: The applicant with its partner has been implementing some projects in the proposed location. Co-financing is possible with this project and the applicant also encourages co-financing by village institutions since currently the government of Indonesia increase the budget for village government that they can spend for village development programs.

Evidence B: Specific projects looking at the Sulewesi landscape are well describe.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 29/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 21/30

Average Total Score: 25/30

Performance of Eol 370 in South East Asia (Islands) - 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: The proposed activities include documentation, farmer empowerment, policy advocacy, rising environmental awareness and women economic empowerment. These activities are strongly aligned with the main objective of ICI to enhance IPLCs' effort to steward land and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits.

Evidence B: Well aligned but scale uncertain - and not clear that sites are well connected

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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: tenure aspect needs better information

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The proposed project has good potential to tackle threats to the proposed location. By enhancing IPLCs' control to the area and obtaining legal recognition of customary territory can prevent further threats to the location. The applicant also explained the activities and outcomes clearly.

Evidence B: no direct linkages made between logical and strong project design, and the originally identified complex threats. implication is improved management and documentation will push back threats, not clearly explained however

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposed activities are well aligner with Eol range of investment

Evidence B: seems very good scale of investment

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;
- Significant

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

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: The applicant has indicated potential co-financing for this project from other donor and village governments.

*Evidence B:*community co-financing is mentioned, but other projects also bring funding towards both biodiversity protection, and land tenure - both outcomes of this project too

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: 2/5 Reviewer B: 3/5

Average: 2.5/5

Evidence A: The proposed location is 108.500 hectares and potential beneficiaries are 4.762 persons.

*Evidence B:*just over 100k identified

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: Additional cultural and livelihood indicators are listed in the EoI, but the applicant does not explain them clearly.

*Evidence B:*clearly derive but not well described, high level and general

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: The proposed project is quite ambitious to obtain legal recognition of customary forest at the end of this project. This makes sense for 5 years of program and this achievement will sustain the IPLC-led conservation in this location.

Evidence B: logic is that legal change provides longer-term impact, this is sound, but financing to support will be needed in the medium term.

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: The applicant indicates that the project is in line with Indonesia Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IBSAP) and the government commitment to reduce carbon emissions.

Evidence B: Light description, but accurate linkages

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: The proposed project clearly explains women participation in implementation as well as a crucial target for the project. The applicant is also aware of the important role of women in conservation and decision-making at the local level. Some activities are specially designed for women empowerment in economy and conservation.

Evidence B: strong description, incorporates also economic and social discriminations

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:* 2/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The applicant has indicated a good example of existing IPLC-led conservation in the proposed location. This project will scale up and replicate such a successful model to be the best practice for community-based conservation at the national and regional level.

Evidence B: route to scale beyond the project sites is not clear

Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 34/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 27/40

Average Total Score: 30.5/40

Performance of Eol 370 in South East Asia (Islands) - 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: 6/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: The proposed project is lead by NGOs and the implementation proposed activities will execute with local NGOs and IPLC groups. Division of tasks are clear among NGOs, but it has not clear with IPLC groups.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: The applicant consists of 4 NGOs that work at a different level and expertise. Local NGOs such as Wallacea and Awam Green have expertise in community organising and participatory mapping, while Bantaya and RMI have good experience in policy advocacy.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 3/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: The role of IPLC groups are not clearly described in the EoI, but they will be included in the implementation of the project. This information is found in the section on women participation in the project implementation.

*Evidence B:*NA

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: 5/5 Reviewer B: 4/5

Average: 4.5/5

Evidence A: The applicants have adequate skills and capacity for the implementation of the project and they have experience involving in GEF-funded projects.

*Evidence B:*difficult to be sure with evidence provided but definitely 3 or 4 here

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: 4/6

Average: 5/6

Evidence A: The applicant annual budget is USD 385.000. Currently, the applicant maintains investment from more than 3 donor agencies.

Evidence B: moderate, would be a stretch, but certainly feasible

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: The applicant is familiar with safeguard standards and involving with some related project from other projects such as MCA-Indonesia and DGM-Indonesia.

Evidence B: safeguards, yes, and similar to the GEF, but not specifically the GEF standards

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 24/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 22/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 370 in South East Asia (Islands) - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

