

Eol Reviews by TRC


Assessment of Eol: 97

Organization: Rise Beyond the Reef

Eol Metadata

name	Eol	Geography	state	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3	Total
Sam Johnston	97	Melanesia	Fiji	26	35	27	88
David Sheppard	97	Melanesia	Fiji	19	23	19	61

Performance of Eol 97 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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: According to ICI database Fiji has high and homogeneously distributed importance. Fiji's marine habitats include estuaries, sea grass, protected and exposed shores, coral reefs, lagoons, and slopes. The country has the third largest area of mangroves in the Pacific Island region.

Evidence B: Biodiversity significance is assessed as "Moderate". The project is in the Yakete district in Ba in Fiji and is within the Ba Catchment area, in Western Viti Levu, the largest island in Fiji. It is one of the largest remaining areas of pristine forest areas in Fiji with indigenous communities living mostly subsistence lifestyles on the land. These forests are critical for the conservation of Fiji's unique biodiversity, and provide valuable ecosystem services such as soil conservation, water purification and carbon storage.

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: 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: Tikina Yakete (Yakete District) Ba, in the project areas, has one of the last remaining unlogged mountain forest in Fiji's Western Division. These areas play an important role in the carbon cycle and also serve as reservoirs of irreplaceable biodiversity and ecosystem services. Value for climate mitigation is assessed as moderate

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: 4/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: According to CI database (Too Big to Ignore) the fisheries were reported as being under either: Co-management / co-governance Community-based management Self governance Whether this applies to a subset or all fisheries is not clear. Also, it is not clear if the self or community-based management has been recognized by the government.

Evidence B: 90% of the forest belong to the indigenous clans and for them forests provide their main source of livelihood. Fiji has traditional land and social boundaries where indigenous people live. Approximately 88% of the land in Fiji is customary owned and is owned communally by the clans (Mataqali), which is the land-owning community unit within the project areas.

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: The important cultural significance of project sites are clearly explained. The indigenous communities in this coastal zone are primarily dependent on their mangroves, reefs and other marine ecosystems for their livelihoods. Through this proposed project, there will be provision of livelihoods alternatives, to ensure the sustainable use of marine and land resources and protection of biodiversity. The specific focus of the project is on womens' empowerment. RBTR already operate in these four separate regions through an Economic & Leadership development program for rural remote indigenous women and their communities. Through this program women from more than 23 villages engage in handicrafts making as an industry, using their traditional knowledge and skills to make crafts, ensure quality control and distribute to a range of national and international buyers. A major part of this rural women economic empowerment program was the setting up of traditional structures to support the work, appointing coordinators at village and district level and training of coordinators who then trained women in communities.

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: 3/5

Average: 3.5/5

Evidence A: The area is greatly vulnerable to forest degradation. Furthermore, loss of traditional farming practices and lack of sustainable farming knowledge have caused inappropriate developments and resource extraction.

Evidence B: Threats to the conservation of terrestrial and marine biodiversity are well described in the EoI and include mangrove loss and degradation; loss and damage to seagrass beds; coral reef bleaching and decline; loss of aquatic ecosystem diversity and fisheries decline; loss of agrobiodiversity and terrestrial biodiversity. The root causes of threats to biodiversity vary but are associated with unsustainable land use practices and resource use

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: 3/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Legal and policy frameworks recognize rights over lands and resources but with constraints (e.g., lack implementing regulations). The work of RBTR focusses on womens empowerment in IPLCs within the project area and also also consistent with relevant policies and frameworks, such as the CBD, the SDGs (especially1, 5, 7, 13, and15), the Fiji REDD plus Strategy and the Draft National Fisheries Policy, 2020. Nationally, the work is very closely aligned to the National Women's Policy, Women's Economic Empowerment strategies.

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: Although it seems there is active government support for IPLC-led conservation in the area according to the EoI, it is important to consider some weaknesses of existing mechanisms to protect forest and marine territories in Fiji. For example, no sustainable financing arrangements within government entities to preserve these territories, even lack of coordination and consultation between relevant stakeholders, among others, which are issues not referred to in the EoI.

Evidence B: RBTR already operates in these four separate regions through an Economic & Leadership development program for rural remote indigenous women and their communities. In 2019, women surpassed \$500,000 FJD in earnings through our Traditional Contemporary Arts & Crafts Income Generating Program. RBTR has worked with women to establish source material plant banks for traditionally important plants which is used for handicraft, a main source of income for women.

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: NA/3

Average: 3/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: Relevant IPLC-led conservation projects have been well established for many years, these have focused on a range of areas relevant to women's empowerment within the project areas. programmes run through the RBTR in support of women's empowerment are outlined in response to Question 4 above

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: NA

Evidence B: A number of projects are outlined, including those associated with REDD+ through the Ministry of Forests and the Ridge to Reef Programme, through WWF. Through RBTR projects, there is an already established network which include District Coordinators and Village Coordinators where women leaders have supervisory roles to assist other women in environmental work, handcraft and sustainable income generation.


Section 1:

Reviewer A Total Score: 26/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 22.5/30

Performance of Eol 97 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: The proposed approach is well aligned with the overall objective of the ICI. The project will enhance IPLCs efforts to steward land, waters and natural resources to deliver global environmental benefits in the project areas.

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: To project aims to ensure culturally suitable strategies are in place to ensure the protection of indigenous people's rights. The project will use a "ground up" approach where people will identify their priorities, design culturally appropriate processes that will work and ensure gender inclusive decision-making processes that ensure implementing of actions that will have long term impact and sustainability. There will be community-based training, capacity building and skills training in communities to ensure empowerment of indigenous groups.

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: 2/3

Average: 2.5/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The project and planned interventions will contribute extensively to supporting biodiversity conservation, reducing the stress on resource use, and contribute to improving the enabling environments in which biodiversity conservation and sustainable use occurs. This means that the rate of resource use should slow down; particularly through supporting a move to other resources for income and social livelihoods.

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: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: NA

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

Scoring:

- None;
- Small;
- Moderate;

- Significant

Reviewer A: 3/3 Reviewer B: 1/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The EoI does not clearly include significant and concrete sources of co-financing. However, it is noted that the RBTR anticipates the program to be 60-80% self-sustaining through sales of sustainable products.

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: 1/5

Average: 1.5/5

Evidence A: This area is certainly relevant for conservation purposes, however, the estimated Global Environmental Benefits (GEF core indicators) are scaled at very low as well as the estimated number of direct benefits from the project.

Evidence B: The project will involve 400 ha under improved management

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: NA

Evidence B: Additional cultural and/or livelihood indicators clearly derive from project goal. Cultural indicators will include contribution of economic earnings to self-sufficiency, rate of resilience to natural disasters, rate of adapting following disasters and loss of food and income sources. Livelihood indicators will look at both men and women contribution to household income and how incomes contribute to households and community functions and participation. Additional indicators will be on successful

partnerships created through the implementation of the projects. Use of traditional knowledge and skills to ensure sustenance of livelihoods will also be additional indicators, to gauge how much indigenous people still use and rely on traditional knowledge bases.

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: 2/3 Reviewer B: 2/3

Average: 2/3

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: However, it is noted that the RBTR anticipates the program to be 60-80% self-sustaining through sales of sustainable products.

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: The project relates to and supports a number of national policies, including those relevant to women's empowerment

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: This EoI provides a robust approach to gender mainstreaming through the promotion of economic & leadership programmes focused on sources of income, especially for women.

Evidence B: The project has significant and well-thought through approach to gender mainstreaming

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: 4/5 Reviewer B: 2/5

Average: 3/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: NA


Section 2:

Reviewer A Total Score: 35/40

Reviewer B Total Score: 23/40

Average Total Score: 29/40

Performance of Eol 97 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: 4/6 Reviewer B: 4/6

Average: 4/6

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: The EoI clearly indicates IPLC leadership throughout the project

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: leadership from IPLCs, particularly womens' groups is well demonstrated

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: There appear to be strong IPLC partnerships that play a central role in design, governance, and implementation of the project;

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: 3/5

Average: 4/5

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: RBTR has a track record and appear to have adequate skills and capacity

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: NA

Evidence B: EoI indicates moderate capacity

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: 1/2 Reviewer B: 1/2

Average: 1/2

Evidence A: NA

Evidence B: NA

Section 3:

Reviewer A Total Score: 27/30

Reviewer B Total Score: 19/30

Average Total Score: 23/30

Performance of Eol 97 in Melanesia - Percentile by Average Score (Section 3)

