

**Evaluation of Rainforest Foundation Norway's
work in Indonesia**

&

**Recommendations for the new RFN Strategy
2018 - 2022**

JANUARY 2017

By Adriana Sri Adhiati and Stephen Leonard

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Between October and December 2016 RFN has undertaken an evaluation of their work in Indonesia through a series of interviews and analyses of relevant documentation. The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact from RFN's work in Indonesia and to receive informed recommendations for RFN's upcoming Indonesia strategy 2018-2022. In particular, the evaluation paid special attention to matters concerning RFNs program design and methodology; whether RFN are focused on the right issues, in the right regions, with the right partners; allocation of resources; and gender.

Overall, RFN partners and other stakeholders are very positive about the work being undertaken by RFN in Indonesia and consider the organization to be doing important and relevant work. RFN are considered to be effective and focused on the most important issues. Most, if not all interviewees are aware that the focus of RFNs work concerning rights, and the linkage between rights and forest protection in Indonesia and RFN are urged by major partners to continue to carry on with current themes and continue to advocate through their partners and internationally for rights-based forest protection plus developing sustainable livelihood of local communities and for the marginalized forest communities to realize sustainable livelihoods.

One of the major themes in RFN's NORAD project concerns securing collective rights for forest peoples to land and resources through legal recognition of customary ownership. This is where RFN have enjoyed the most significant success and made important progress in Indonesia. The MK35 Constitutional Court decision in May 2013 is rightfully considered to be '*momentus*', however, despite the slow and highly complex implementation of the decision, real implementation on the ground is now underway as of December 2016 where President Jokowi recognized *hutan adat* in 9 communities. This is a very significant impact and takes Indonesia's land management one important step closer to rights-based forest protection. HuMa are widely recognized as a front-runner in this work.

AMAN, another critical partner to RFNs work have also succeeded in having President Jokowi include measures to ensure the respect of indigenous peoples in his political priority agenda, such as a review of all bills related to natural resources, tenure and indigenous peoples to ensure that these respect the MK35 decision. Whilst AMAN has drafted a Bill on the Recognition and Protection of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples it has not yet been passed through the Parliament, and uncertainty has been expressed as to whether this will eventuate. Recent developments concerning the recognition of *hutan adat* has however revived waning support for Jokowi amongst CSOs on this topic.

REDD+ implementation has been a long time focus for RFN in Indonesia, most importantly due to the relationship between the Norwegian and Indonesian Governments on the topic. However, more recently, Indonesia's implementation of REDD+ has been marred by serious political challenges. Indonesia was an international REDD+ frontrunner but the dismantling of the REDD+ agency has halted ongoing initiatives. This 'near stagnation' has not only impacted on multiple policy processes put in place, but also on the implementation of the RFN strategy as well as RFN partner organizations. These significant changes in direction demonstrate how fickle policy processes can be in Indonesia and highlights the importance of flexibility in strategies.

Building individual and institutional capacity has played a central role in RFN's work in Indonesia. Support provided by RFN for legal drafting skills have proven effective for partners to write bills or concept notes, which are more readily accepted by officials or

parliamentarians. RFN seek to strengthen partner organizations and empower local communities and are widely recognized as playing an important and unique role in strengthening civil society in Indonesia. Strengthening institutional capacity was one of the major issues raised by stakeholders and it is a challenge that will be ongoing for RFN to balance between building capacity and knowing when and how to withdraw support through appropriate exit strategies.

Many partners also see the value in some level of enhanced coordination and collaboration at the national and sub national levels. Collaboration amongst NGOs is said to be too weak and requires some improvement in Indonesia. Several interviewees mentioned there to be a need for enhanced collaboration amongst the partners of RFN, and more broadly especially between those working at the national level and those working at the sub national level. Partners are not seeing the strategic links between the sub national groups or the national groups. As RFN considers its strategic approach and geographical focus, it will need to, not only consider linkages between sub national, national and international policies and processes but also the risks associated with, for example, increasing emphasis on high forest areas such as Papua.

RFN is also a lead organization amongst civil society working at the international level on land use related issues in the UNFCCC, however the lack of understanding of linkages and relevance of international processes to work at the national and sub national level is consistently a challenge. Indonesian colleagues attending UNFCCC meetings and working amongst networks such as CLARA and the RSWG have been on a high turnover and those who do attend are often overwhelmed by the complexities of the information. Interviewees have suggested that this problem be remedied through enhanced engagement during the course of the year, including between meetings and more consistency in terms of attendance and engagement at these meetings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Interviews have been undertaken with representatives from AMAN, HuMa, KKI WARSI, WALHI Kalteng, Yayasan Citra Mandiri, Yayasan Merah Putih, Perempuan AMAN, Paradisea, YALI, Silva Papua Lestari, Climate and Land Use Alliance (CLUA), Ford Foundation, The Norwegian Government, The Peatland Restoration Agency, Madani, The Waxman Foundation and Mighty, The Asia Foundation, the Forest Peoples Programme, NICFI, The Ministry of Environment and Forestry and all independent persons providing information in their personal capacity.

The evaluation team was retained in mid October 2016 and consisted of two independent evaluators, Adriana Sri Adhiati and Stephen Leonard, who both have thorough experience in matters relating to Indonesia's contextual setting nationally and internationally, policy development, environmental issues, indigenous movements and civil society.

The evaluators would like to thank all partners and stakeholders for generously providing their time and for their openness during this process.

All documents and data collected from interviews will be treated as confidential and used solely to facilitate analysis. Interviewees will not be quoted in the reports without their permission and all interviewees have been given the option of anonymity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE AND EXPECTED USE OF EVALUATION.....	1
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	1
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND CONTENT.....	2
PRINCIPLE FINDINGS.....	4
General Understanding of RFNs work in Indonesia and internationally.....	4
RFN'S IMPACT IN INDONESIA.....	5
Securing collective rights for forest peoples to land and resources.....	6
Implementation of REDD+ in Indonesia.....	8
Institutional Strengthening and empowerment of local communities.....	10
International Engagement.....	12
MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN NEW RFN STRATEGY.....	13
Building Institutional Capacity.....	13
Building Capacity for International Engagement.....	15
Improving collaboration.....	16
Engagement with the private sector.....	17
Other.....	18
GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS.....	20
VISIBILITY.....	21
CONCLUSIONS.....	22
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AIPP	Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact Foundation
AMAN	Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara / Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago
BRG	Badan Restorasi Gambut / Peatland Restoration Agency
CFI	Climate and Forest Initiative Support Scheme
CLARA	Climate, Land, Ambition and Rights Alliance
CLUA	Climate and Land Use Alliance
COP	Conference of Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FPIC	Free, prior and informed consent
HuMa	Perkumpulan untuk Pembaharuan Hukum Berbasis Masyarakat dan Ekologis / Community and Ecological based Society for Law Reform
INDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contribution
IPs	Indigenous Peoples
IPOP	Indonesian Palm Oil Pledge
KPH	Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan / Forest Management Unit
MK35	Constitutional Court Decision concerning Customary Forests
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
REDD-plus	Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of carbon stocks
RFN	Rainforest Foundation Norway
RSWG	REDD-plus Safeguards Working Group
SPL	Silva Papua Lestari
UNFCCC	United National Framework Convention on Climate Change
Walhi	Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia/Friends of the Earth Indonesia
YALI	Yayasan Lingkungan Hidup Papua
YCM	Yayasan Citra Mandiri
YMP	Yayasan Merah Putih

PURPOSE AND EXPECTED USE OF EVALUATION

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact from RFN's work in Indonesia and to receive informed recommendations for RFN's upcoming Indonesia strategy 2018-2022. The evaluation has the following objectives:

1. To document RFN's overall impact in Indonesia;
2. To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the RFN's work against the previous strategy; and
3. To provide recommendations for RFN's new five year strategy in Indonesia (2018-22).

The evaluation documents both the significance of RFN's partnership with partner organizations in Indonesia as well as RFN's direct contribution as a campaigning and advocacy actor operating on various levels including sub nationally and nationally and in Norway and internationally.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In order to meet the objectives, the evaluation team was provided with background reading documents (i.e RFN proposals and reports and partner evaluations), and undertook a series of interviews with RFN partners at the local and national level in Indonesia as well as other stakeholders, including during UNFCCC COP 22 in Marrakech with direct knowledge of, or a direct interest in the work being undertaken by RFN.

The interviews took place over an 8 week period during November and December 2016, mostly in person in Jakarta, Papua, Sumatra and on phone/skype with 10 partners and other stakeholders. An evaluation framework was developed and included a timeline, division of tasks and interview scheme including a series of guiding questions, which are included at **ANNEX 1**. The evaluation places emphasis on key themes as follows

- **Relevance:** the extent to which the program design is suited to achieve the overall and part goals of the current strategy.
- **Effectiveness:** the extent to which the goals have been achieved, and whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs of the program
- **Efficiency:** how the results stand in relation to the resources used. Comparing inputs with outputs, how economically inputs are converted to outputs. Whether the same results could have been achieved in another way. To what degree do the outputs achieved derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources.
- **Impact:** the changes, positive and negative, planned and unforeseen of the program, seen in relation to goals and target groups
- **Sustainability:** an assessment of the extent to which the positive effects of the program will still continue without RFN's presence.

In particular, the evaluation paid special attention to matters concerning RFNs program design and methodology; whether RFN are focused on the right issues, in the right regions, with the right partners; allocation of resources; and gender.

The evaluation was undertaken over a period of 10 weeks from mid October until late

December 2016. Indonesia is a very complex environment with a very significant number of organisations and individuals involved in RFN's work. The evaluators do hold the view that further work could be done to ensure a more comprehensive, accurate and useful evaluation for both RFN and their donors. A number of enquiries were unable to be completed in the time and remain outstanding and it would be useful to go back to some organisations and interviewees to verify information, ask additional questions and inform the evaluation further. Also, several requested interviews were unable to be secured.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND CONTENT

Rainforest Foundation Norway (RFN) is one of Europe's leading organizations in the work to protect the world's rainforests and strengthen the rights of indigenous peoples, in cooperation with local indigenous and environmental organizations in Southeast Asia, Central Africa and the Amazon. Since its creation in 1989, RFN has espoused a rights-based approach to rainforest protection.

Since 1997 RFN has developed partnerships with civil society organizations in Indonesia. They have focused on forest protection and securing the rights of indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities. Their first major achievement was the creation of Bukit Duabelas National Park, the first Indonesian national park to be established with the aim of protecting the habitat of forest peoples. In 2007, RFN expanded its work to the two provinces of Papua and West Papua. At the same time, the concept of REDD-plus was introduced at the UNFCCC COP in Bali. In 2010, Norway entered into a one billion dollar REDD-plus agreement with Indonesia, resulting in increased focus on forest protection and emission reductions in Indonesia. As a result of such new political opportunities, RFN has gradually shifted focus from geographically limited local projects, to increased advocacy and policy efforts on a national level, although these two approaches still work in tandem. More recently, on analyses of the current projects and strategy, RFN has also shifted more focus on the subject of rights of indigenous peoples.

RFN's work in Indonesia is driven by a combination of objectives, an overall goal, a consolidated goal, programme goals and 'part goals'. These goals are set out in the RFN Strategy 2008 – 2017, as revised in 2012 (RFN Strategy). The funding from the current NORAD project 2013 – 2017 (NORAD Project), the majority of RFN funding, includes 4 main themes as well as a number of objectives and goals that are consistent, albeit not the same as the RFN Strategy. The evaluation considers these goals and objectives and the actions under the relevant programmes in the RFN Strategy and the NORAD Project, together with analyses of other material, including the RFN report to NORAD (undated) and provides a series of recommendations concerning the next phase of RFN's work in Indonesia for consideration in their new strategy.

The RFN Strategy sets out RFN's global mission, which is to support indigenous peoples and traditional populations of the world's rainforests in their efforts to protect their environment and fulfill their rights by assisting them in securing and controlling the natural resources necessary for their long-term well-being and managing these resources in ways which do not harm their environment, violate their culture or compromise their future; and developing the means to protect their individual and collective rights and to obtain, shape, and control basic services from the state. It states that the overall goal of RFN is a world where the rainforest is effectively protected and the rights of its inhabitants are fully ensured. The 'consolidated goal' for the period 2008–2017 is that by 2017 rights-based sustainable rainforest management is

implemented in important rainforest areas in all countries where RFN and its partner organizations have been active for more than five years.

The RFN Strategy states that to carry out its mission and achieve its goals RFN will: support programs and projects in cooperation with local organizations, indigenous peoples, and traditional populations of the rainforest; seek changes in the policies and practices of governments (in countries with and without rainforests), intergovernmental bodies, and private enterprises; and generate and strengthen national and international public awareness and action.

The RFN Strategy contains a Programme Goal that rights-based sustainable rainforest management is implemented in significant areas of Indonesia. Within this Programme goal are 'Part Goals' specific to work in Indonesia seeking for:

- NGOs, indigenous peoples' organizations and forest based communities have the capacity to advocate for rights-based sustainable rainforest management in a coordinated and strategic manner.
- Legal instruments and policies protecting rainforest areas while respecting the rights of forest based communities are introduced locally and nationally in Indonesia.
- The rights of indigenous peoples and forest based communities are strengthened in legal instruments on relevant levels of government in Indonesia.
- Effective measures such as law enforcement, transparency and participation are implemented nationally to ensure good governance in the forestry sector in Indonesia.
- Areas where sustainable rights-based rainforest management is implemented serve as models for reforming national policies and legislation in Indonesia.

The RFN Advocacy Strategy seeks to ensure that partner organizations in Southeast Asia, have *substantially* influenced national policies and local decision-making to make rainforest protection based on the rights of forest peoples a cornerstone of national development strategies for rainforest regions; and to secure compensation for rainforest countries and forest dependent peoples and communities for protecting their forests.

Well aligned with these goals and objectives, the NORAD Project follows four themes: Securing collective rights for forest peoples to land and resources; Sustainable management of rainforest areas; Strengthening of partner organisations and empowerment of local communities, building on their culture and traditional knowledge; and countering the drivers of deforestation. The evaluation, in part, follows these four themes.

Currently, RFN has 10 partner organizations in Jakarta, Bogor, Sumatra, Central Kalimantan, Central Sulawesi, West Papua and Papua. It should be noted however that the new funding proposal submitted to NORAD only includes allowance for funding to 4 organisations, including an unnamed 'miscellaneous organisation', and the evaluators have not been provided with information to suggest that funding will continue for several of the current partners. We have reviewed those provisions of the RFN Strategy concerning 'exit strategies' and anticipate that, where funding for organisations will cease, if at all, appropriate exit strategies have been put in place. If however funding will continue for these organisations, information concerning this would be useful to the evaluation, especially in relation to the recommendations concerning the new strategy.

RFN undertake their work through engagement and partnering with NGOs, indigenous peoples' organizations and forest based communities that have the capacity to advocate for rights-based sustainable rainforest management in a coordinated and strategic manner. To achieve the objective they undertake targeted interventions to establish and reform legal instruments and policies protecting rainforest areas while respecting the rights of forest based communities both locally and nationally in Indonesia. They seek to ensure the rights of indigenous peoples and forest based communities are strengthened in legal instruments on relevant levels of government in Indonesia and that effective measures such as law enforcement, transparency and participation are implemented nationally to ensure good governance in the forestry sector in Indonesia.

In 2016, RFN started the process of developing a new overall strategy for the period 2018-30, and a more concrete Indonesia strategy for the period 2018-22. In relation to this process, it is timely to assess overall impact in Indonesia during the previous strategy period, and to get input for the new five-year strategy.

PRINCIPLE FINDINGS

It is important to note from the outset that a number of interviewees made the point that it is difficult to attribute policy reform in Indonesia directly to RFN without undertaking a more detailed analyses and impact assessment which distinguishes between RFN funded projects and those funded by other donors to RFN partners. The evaluators agree with this observation and note that we have not been provided with this information. The evaluation therefore is expressed in many places in terms of where we consider RFN to have made a contribution to an outcome or an impact.

General Understanding of RFNs work in Indonesia and internationally

The evaluators were asked to gain a general understanding from interviewees of the work being undertaken by RFN in Indonesia. Due to the broad range of stakeholders interviewed, it is useful to split this section of the evaluation out into a national / subnational and international context.

Awareness of RFN work at the National / Sub National Level

Despite the fact that several partners and stakeholders interviewed are aware of and also do engage with RFN at the international level, the overwhelming immediate response on the subject of awareness of their work related to the national and the sub national level. Responses were varied based on the interviewees knowledge of the organization, time involved and differed between partner organizations and those interviewees who are not direct partners. Overall, people are very positive about the work being undertaken by RFN in Indonesia and consider the organization to be doing important and relevant work, are effective and remain consistently focused on the most important issues over the long term.

Most, if not all interviewees are aware that the focus of RFNs work concerning rights, and the linkage between rights and forest protection in Indonesia. It was consistently emphasized in interviews that rights and forest issues are not able to be separated.

It was clear that there was a general understanding that RFN focused on Sumatra, Kalimantan and Papua. Least seemed known about RFN's work in Papua. Interestingly, no single international stakeholder interviewee seemed to be aware with any level of certainty of the entirety of the organizations supported by RFN in Indonesia whereas national level partners have a strong awareness of each others efforts. It was mentioned

by one interviewee that there is no clarity on what RFN do and do not fund and RFNs physical presence and visibility (or lack thereof) in Indonesia, was considered to be mostly beneficial to assisting RFN to achieve their overall objective and have impact, and is discussed in more detail below. Organisations that stood out and mentioned the most include AMAN, WARSI and HuMa.

RFN's long term and ongoing support of around 17 years for WARSI was emphasized by some, however concerns were raised as to whether it is useful to replicate the experience with WARSI when RFN look to undertake work in Papua, and ensure local communities are enabled to 'think for themselves' when it comes to project design and implementation. One interviewee expressed concern at the extent to which success is attributed to WARSI in Sumatra, and considers that their work should not be considered to be a success in circumstances where the forest loss in the region has been so significant.

Knowledge of specific work was identified including efforts concerning rights based consultations, a strong social justice / human rights focus with emphasis on local people, emphasis on indigenous rights and mapping of territories to assist with securing land tenure, the Constitutional Court decision concerning customary forests, the role of RFN funded organizations in coordination work amongst the NGO community, and linkage between organizations such as AMAN to high level decisions makers including the President of Indonesia.

Awareness of RFN work at the International Level

Although RFN have been clearly visible in the international UNFCCC negotiations for some time, the role of partner organisations is less visible. HuMa has been traditionally the most engaged in the UNFCCC, however is no longer visible. AMAN are present usually at a COP, and involved in surrounding events, however their engagement with other CSOs working in the negotiation process and undertaking lobbying in the process is less apparent.

AMAN rightly consider themselves as the backbone to the populist indigenous peoples movement and are highly regarded as influential at the regional international level, particularly within the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) and some concern has been expressed that there may be tensions amongst some donors related to the role of the two networks. It was mentioned in confidence that one donor sought for AMAN to provide some level of regional representation on behalf of IPs, however out of solidarity to AIPP, AMAN refused this role indicating strong and trusting relationships between AMAN and the broader international IPs movement.

RFN'S WORK IN INDONESIA

The RFN Strategy specifies that they seek to inform and ensure policy impact through linking levels of action. The RFN Strategy states that it is important for RFN and its partner organizations to be active at all levels and national and international policy efforts should be informed by local experiences. The RFN strategy identifies a need to direct greater effort into influencing political and legal decisions at the national and international level in the period covered by the strategy, which is up to 2017. One of the target groups identified by the Strategy consists of governments at local, regional, and national levels and all projects need to have provisions for policy work, so that actors at government levels can be influenced to improve existing legal frameworks and practices affecting forest-dependent peoples and rainforest ecosystems.

RFN are urged by major partners to continue to carry on with current themes and continue to focus on rights-based forest protection plus developing sustainable livelihood of local communities and the important point was made that RFN and their partners need to carry on with the empowerment of the marginalised and that 20 years of work is still the beginning and to complete the work it needs at least to cover 1 generation.

Securing collective rights for forest peoples to land and resources

The RFN Strategy correctly specifies that working together with people at the grassroots will always be fundamental for RFN. The primary target group for RFN's work is rainforest-based peoples and communities – both indigenous peoples and traditional populations, however the strategy also identifies that a much larger group of people, often smallholder farmers, also depends on the use of forest resources, and is included in RFN's work in various ways. In the RFN Strategy they confirm that they will increase their focus on the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights and this appears to be an ongoing emphasis, having regard to the new proposal to NORAD, entitled '*Rights Based REDD+: Indigenous Peoples as Guardians of the Forest*', otherwise referred to as the RFN Climate Forest Initiative Support Scheme (CFI Programme). Partners consider that advocacy for the marginalised forest communities to realise sustainable livelihood is still very relevant for Indonesia and RFN should be cautious not to allow for an over emphasis on indigenous peoples to occur to the detriment of gains that could be made through emphasis on local communities and small-holder farmers. To do so may reduce the potential impact of RFNs work in Indonesia due to the high relevance of these other groups.

One of the major themes in RFN's NORAD project concerns securing collective rights for forest peoples to land and resources through legal recognition of customary ownership premised on research to say that forests where people have recognized land rights are better protected than other forest areas. RFN's own report to NORAD considers that the most prominent results of the program in Indonesia are related to land tenure.

Several interviewees identify RFN's success in this context and recognized that perhaps the highest profile success, which can be partly attributed to RFN support for Indonesian CSOs during the period of the evaluation relates to the Constitutional Court decision concerning customary forest (MK35) and the subsequent implementation work. This success, in May 2013 is considered to be '*momentus*' in RFN's report to NORAD and such legal outcomes are a highly effective and efficient way to achieve significant impact. This decision confirmed indigenous peoples' rights to traditional territories, and the first recognition of *hutan adat* occurred in December 2016, during the course of this evaluation. There is wide agreement on the importance of the implementation at the local and national level of this very significant legal outcome. AMAN are usually attributed as being the main organization to which this success is attributed due to their involvement with the Petition itself, however we understand that HuMa, Epistema and others also played a critical role, which is not as well recognized amongst actors outside the Indonesian CSO networks and in media.

The impact of MK35 on the ground continues to be felt and has resulted in an increase in communities claiming customary entitlements to land. However, the process has been slow and despite some Regulations having been put in place, and some areas gaining recognition, the administrative processes and associated implementation is complex and difficult with local level bottlenecks. HuMa has taken a lead role on the implementation of this decision and has actively taken a leading role in advocating the issuance of a Ministerial Regulation (Permenhut) on 'adat forest', Kajang bylaw and

Lebak bylaw, together with AMAN, Epistema and WARSI. This success and impact, which can be attributed to HuMa is recognized by RFN in their report to NORAD, which states that, with HuMa as a front-runner, RFN's partners have worked to pilot the implementation of MK35 through local regulations.

Ongoing challenges associated with securing further customary land ownership in these areas include lacking regional regulations being in place and incomplete boundary delineation. Contradicting laws between the national and local level on the topic are also proving to be problematic and there is a need for better policy and legal cohesion.

Having regard to specific legal issues associated with land tenure, the subject of whether *hutan desa* or *hutan adat* is sought for a community has come up in some discussions. We understand that this has been a contentious issue amongst some RFN partners and is addressed on a case-by-case basis, and differently across partners. It is recognized that establishment of *hutan desa* may be a faster and less complex approach to securing clarity of land tenure and as a step towards *hutan adat*, whereas it may also be perceived as undermining *hutan adat*. As pointed out by one partner, when measuring GHG emissions, studies show that when there was recognition of *hutan desa* there was no more emissions from deforestation and seeking *hutan desa* will be more useful where identification of connection to an area is more difficult. Another partner has said that the most important target should be to get the forests into the hands of the people and away from investors, and *hutan desa*, although not ideal, provides ammunition for local communities to claim and manage their forests themselves. WARSI explains that in Jambi, since the community was permitted to manage the forest under *hutan desa* in 2012, it saw zero deforestation in the area by the time data was taken again in 2015. We are assured that where there are differences in view on the topic, there is no tension amongst partners concerning the issue.

The new RFN CFI Programme builds on this work, which of note does not include one of the main organisations leading, namely HuMa, and seeks to achieve at least 15 national/provincial/local policies or regulations affecting forest management and/or indigenous peoples' and other forest-dependent communities' rights to customary territories are developed and advocated.

As stated by the RFN report to NORAD, the MK35 decision highlights the importance of mapping and titling indigenous territories. The report states, and which the evaluators also support as of high relevance, that AMAN have succeeded in having indigenous territories included in the One Map Initiative - a breakthrough, as the government previously had no overview of indigenous territories. Walhi Kalteng has further succeeded with participatory mapping of the territories of ten communities and Paradisea

inform the evaluators that RFN funding has enabled participatory mapping in 3 areas, with support of local district leaders. RFN'S Report to NORAD recognises that, in West Papua, detailed village land use surveys have been undertaken in order to identify sustainable and economically rewarding income generation opportunities for local forest based populations. Further, within a relatively short period, SPL has made significant progress building a new institution, which bring together different stakeholders, including civil servants, local government agencies and state enterprises to support the existence of customary community and forest. Each of the above indicating effective measures to achieve the goals of RFN.

On the subject of law and policy reform, the NORAD Project identifies that RFN and partners aim to work for local regulations protecting forest and securing communities' access to land in new areas, and to expand the number of communities under the village

forest concession scheme. HuMA, WARSI, YCM and Frans Siahaan of the Asia Foundation and former Director of YCM all confirm that the support provided by RFN for legal drafting skills have proven effective for them to come up with more progressive bills or concept notes, which are more readily accepted by officials or parliamentarians, who themselves are not necessarily well equipped with such skills. Some examples of impact include YMP led capacity building for advocacy skills and their support to the establishment of 2 local regulations that have been passed. YMP have also had success in progress towards the establishment of *adat* through the Customary Community School, known as the “Lipu School”, noting that training, skills development and education are efficient and important ways of ensuring sustainability of outcomes.

More recently, and as recognised in the RFN report to NORAD, AMAN have succeeded in having President Jokowi include measures to ensure the respect of indigenous peoples in his political priority agenda, such as a review of all bills related to natural resources, tenure and indigenous peoples to ensure that these respect the MK35. Whilst AMAN has drafted a Bill on the Recognition and Protection of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples it has not yet been passed through the Parliament, and uncertainty has been expressed as to whether this will eventuate. Recent developments concerning the recognition of *hutan adat* has revived waning support for Jokowi amongst CSOs on this topic. It should however be noted that whilst RFN continue to, and increase their emphasis on ‘indigenous peoples’, the concept of ‘indigenous Indonesians’ remains contentious in Indonesia and the Government takes the position that all Indonesian people are ‘Indigenous’. It has been suggested by one interviewee that RFN should place more emphasis on locality, and local people.

Implementation of REDD+ in Indonesia

Another of the 4 main themes under the RFN NORAD Project is that of sustainable management of rainforest areas, which can fall directly into the context of one of the 5 REDD+ activities. For the purposes of this evaluation we consider RFN’s partners work on REDD+ more broadly. In this context, the RFN Strategy identifies that during the lifetime of the organization, no international process or mechanism has carried the same potential for actually changing the rules of the game than the negotiations regarding forest protection under the climate convention, known as REDD+. For this reason, RFN have placed a significant amount of emphasis on REDD+ at the sub national, national and international levels, both in a policy development and an implementation context. RFN’s partners have been involved in the formulation of REDD+ strategies in Jambi, Central Kalimantan, West Sumatra, Central Sulawesi, and West Papua and Papua.

The road to REDD+ implementation has however not been free of challenges in Indonesia. The RFN report to NORAD identifies correctly that Indonesia used to be an international REDD+ frontrunner through such initiatives as a moratorium on new forest concessions, a national REDD+ strategy had been finalized, a REDD+ Agency was in the making, and a finance mechanism was being discussed. The momentum was considerable. The report further notes that the [dismantling of the REDD+ agency] proved disastrous for REDD+ progress, and effectively halted ongoing initiatives and that the momentum on REDD+ is about to be lost in Indonesia. This ‘near stagnation’ has not only impacted on multiple policy processes put in place, but also on the implementation of the RFN strategy as well as RFN partner organisations. For example, HuMa worked with the REDD+ Agency on how the benefit sharing financial mechanism which has not advanced, causing HuMa to dismantle its team working on the subject and AMAN developed and tested a manual for monitoring safeguards within indigenous communities, however the monitoring system will now not be tested unless and until REDD+ is implemented. The One Map Initiative has also faced the same delay as and its

status is unclear. One partner interprets the change in the One Map Policy to have shrunk to now only include peatlands as a part of the new peatland restoration agenda, and considers this to be a backward step that RFN will need to address going forward.

RFN note in their report to NORAD that this near stagnation in REDD+ initiatives since mid-2014, such as the implementation of the national strategy, the One Map Initiative, and the establishment of a finance mechanism, has made the full achievement of the outcome indicators difficult.

These significant changes in direction demonstrate how fickle policy processes can be in Indonesia. A change in government can give rise to significant changes, however this should not come as any surprise as it has always been the case. This raises the question of efficient use of resources and the subject of flexibility or rigidity of strategies. It is well known that policy influence requires flexible approaches to rapidly adapt to changes, especially changes of government. The question emerges as to whether the flexibility entrenched in the RFN strategy is being properly utilized to ensure this is the case. The evaluators have not been provided with any documentation evidencing any review of the Strategy during this period of significant change in Indonesia, and unless informed otherwise, understand the only Strategy reviews to have occurred are in 2012 and the current review. We are however informed by RFN, and confirmed by partners that partners have the flexibility to change work plans and budgets annually, however we have not analyzed any such partner revisions.

Notwithstanding these circumstances, the RFN report to NORAD identifies that REDD+ has increased the space for the participation of civil society, including for indigenous peoples in policy making and implementation. Interviewees did support this and identify that there has been a significant and important paradigm shift in how CSOs and government communicate, and that this has been a change that has occurred since the commencement of the policy developments related to REDD+. Walhi Kalteng mention that collaboration with communities supported by funding from RFN has enabled for local testing of the effectiveness of REDD and strengthening relevant policies. It is mentioned by several interviewees that REDD+ has been positive in uniting CSOs amongst themselves as well as with Government and this more collaborative approach is now spreading to the private sector. Many consultations are now being undertaken and many CSOs become involved in different roles, becoming members of boards of other initiatives whilst avoiding being entirely drawn into the Indonesian Government bureaucracy.

Interviewees have also identified several areas of policy impact, influence and effectiveness by RFN supported organizations, including ongoing engagement and influence concerning the 'Letter of Intent' commitments made by Norway to Indonesia; the establishment of the REDD+ Agency (which was later dismantled) as well as the inclusion of FPIC and Safeguards policies in the Agency, noting that these policies remain alive and possibly able to be used for other circumstances; advocacy related to peatland fires and the establishment of the Peatland Restoration Agency (BRG); the peatland moratorium; the forest moratorium; preventing forest exploitation in Siberut; and succeeding in putting the issue of indigenous rights clearly on the Government's agenda.

A further subject matter that should be identified and highlighted as a part of any recent review, and which relates to REDD+ in Indonesia is that of Indonesia's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) and its more recent Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) as required under the Paris Agreement. From our review of the documents provided from RFN, it would appear that RFN does not expressly and clearly

take Indonesia's NDC into consideration to ensure its projects are aligned with and support both NDC implementation as well as increasing ambition. As it is expected that the implementation of the Paris Agreement and the NDC will be a major policy driver related to actions in the land sector in Indonesia, framing interventions to ensure they support and contribute to this implementation may generate policy impact pathways with more political 'buy in' at the national level and create linkages and examples that can be demonstrated to international level climate processes, for example demonstrating how *hutan adat* recognition can contribute to Indonesia's NDC.

Institutional Strengthening and empowerment of local communities

A further core theme in RFN's NORAD Project is that of strengthening of partner organisations and empowerment of local communities, building on their culture and traditional knowledge. RFN work on the premise that local organisations are essential for rainforest protection and seek to support forest-based communities in their efforts to voice their own concerns directly. The RFN Strategy specifically focuses on strengthening civil society as an important goal and the organization seeks to build long-term partnerships with local and national organizations, rather than investing in creating a network of rainforest foundations in the South. RFN consider that lasting improvements in a country depend on strong internal actors and to support the development of representative indigenous associations and community-based organizations is a priority task. In undertaking this work, RFN sees its role as a facilitator, supporter, and as a partner and is determined to ensure that women are involved in all phases of project development and implementation. RFN emphasize the importance of working with local people in their Strategy in order to ensure involvement in long-term social processes and consider themselves to have a responsibility to understand the local context.

RFN are widely recognized as playing an important and unique role in strengthening civil society in Indonesia on rights and forest issues, an important condition necessary to enable pressure on Government for policy reform. However it appears that there is some inconsistency in how this has developed 'on-the-ground'. For example AMAN has consistently grown and has moved into a position whereby the organization cannot be ignored by the Government, however, HuMa, despite the high importance and success of their work on law and policy, particularly in relation to implementing the outcome of MK35, has reduced in size and therefore capacity.

HuMa is one of the more highly regarded partner organisations, in particular amongst government Ministries, and are recognized for their legal abilities, advice and skills. In fact, HuMa is considered by one interviewee to be one of the highest achievements of RFN for their work to strengthen *adat* rights, for example the work undertaken on Perdas. We note that RFN has identified a number of challenges associated with HuMa's financial management, human resources and strategy development in more recent times, which we understand are currently in the process of being rectified and ongoing funding beyond 2017 is uncertain. We take this opportunity to highlight that discontinuation of such work may carry negative impacts on the target communities, which would not be consistent with RFN's strategy to support initiatives that are in the long-term interest of the communities. Although no documentation concerning any exit strategy has been provided in relation to HuMa or any other organization, we are informed by RFN that should any funding cease, exit strategies will be put in place. The Project states that these exit strategies are realized through a several year period of phasing out with decreasing financial support but strong emphasis on supporting partners in their attempts to gain increased independence and secure the continuation of the organisation and its work. We are informed by RFN that any such exit strategies

are likely to be over a period of 2 years. This issue goes directly to the heart of the question of sustainability.

The partners receiving support from RFN express their appreciation for their investment in long-term social processes and letting partners lead the way, however it was reported by one (non partner) interviewee that RFNs long-term regular funding (not the programme funding) does have some tendency to create complacency, a matter which could be mitigated where organizations have multiple sources of funding. Notwithstanding, RFN support for indigenous communities and forest peoples together with local NGO partners is considered to have assisted these groups in gaining the confidence to speak eye-to-eye with the authorities, which has made a significant contribution to lobbying impact, engagement and freedom to conduct customary education for younger generations. It is reported that RFN support has contributed to enabling 'open' communication concerning customary land entitlements.

The relationship *between* partner organizations associated with RFN is a primary importance to both RFN itself and also to its partners. Indonesia is a complex environment in which to work and can become particularly complex where competition for limited resources coupled with a very extensive amount of highly complicated policy and legal issues are involved. RFN's partner organizations are diverse and although they need to be cohesive and collaborate, it is recognized that it is not necessary for them to undertaken the same strategy.

An important issue raised by several interviewees concerns the level of collaboration as between RFN partners. It is said to be too weak, that there is a lack of connection between partners and requires some improvement. We understand that partner meetings are held annually and it has been suggested that these meetings be held on a more regular basis to build capacity and share lessons across the network. It has been expressed that enhanced collaboration would strengthen the work at the national level, which would then in turn, have the effect of strengthening the work at the sub national level. Concerns have been expressed that complementarity across partner organizations is not being adequately captured and capitalized and RFN are the only organization in a position to have a full understanding of the scope of work of each of the individual organizations. This lack of connectivity across the partners of RFN also makes it challenging to identify the overall impact of the work being undertaken throughout Indonesia.

The notion that the relationship with RFN is a long-term one is strongest amongst the earlier, longer term partners. RFN is considered to be a friend and collaborator in the social movement for partners such as AMAN, WARSI, HuMa and YCM, not only because of multi-year agreement between them and RFN, but also the shared history of going through '*reformasi*' together. During this period of time, RFN has also grown significantly. RFN is trusted by many and viewed as having the 'spirit' of being part of the 'movement'. However, for the relatively new partners (in Papua especially) RFN is considered more as a donor, and in some cases is the only source of income. The RFN Strategy recognizes this challenge to be able to combine the roles of a donor, providing funding and exercising control, with that of a partner: an actor who shares the objectives of the local people and takes on whatever role is necessary and feasible in order to reach the goal.

Turning to a specific example of institutional strengthening and empowerment, through the support of RFN, amongst other donors, AMAN has become one of the strongest Indigenous Peoples organizations in Asia, if not globally, and plays an important role in inspiring other similar organisations. RFN's support for AMAN has been effective and

has had significant impact and has proven to be sustainable. AMAN have hosted Indigenous leaders from other countries in Indonesia and through their projects related to community radio and television have provided leading examples that are being replicated in other countries, including Cambodia, Thailand and Nepal. Recent steps being taken by AMAN to establish the womans network has contributed significantly to the AIPP gender policy and there is increasing demand related to legal support, which AMAN are also well prepared for through their legal branch. It is noted that Perempuan AMAN or the Alliance of Indigenous Women of the Archipelago is one of the recipients of funding to be provided through the new CFI project. In this context, the RFN Strategy concerning Indonesia identifies that RFN will devote particular attention to developing local indigenous peoples' organizations.

The growth of AMAN is widely recognized and considered to be impressive and the organization is becoming more and more independent and less reliant on funding from RFN. Although no longer directly involved in their governance structure, AMAN also continue to be active in the development of the regional and international work of AIPP and have been consistent on this engagement.

One additional concern raised by interviewees relates to the manner in which many individuals working with civil society in Indonesia progress on to Government positions. It has been said that President Jokowi has deliberately moved, and succeeded in bringing experts with an NGO background more into the government. This has created some tensions between those outside and those inside the government, where positions have been awarded to some individuals over others and where expectations that those working previously for NGOs are unable to achieve the change they may have initially intended to achieve.

Overall, RFN have an excellent relationship with their partners and are well respected. However, projects and strategies appear to work on an assumption that support for institutional capacity is something that would be provided for smaller, newer, less experienced organizations and does not appear to contemplate a circumstance where more well established organizations encounter internal difficulties related to management, including financial mismanagement, which can happen easily through staff hire or appointment. Further, the section in the NORAD project on strengthening local CSOs does not seem as thought through as other programmes and themes, for example there are no indicators, priorities, goals or objectives, but rather general statements. RFN may wish to strengthen its role on this topic in its new strategy.

International Engagement

The RFN Strategy considers it a priority to increase the international advocacy work of RFN and its partners. One of RFN'S strategic goals is to ensure that rights-based sustainable rainforest management is recognized as a leading approach to rainforest management by relevant multilateral organizations, national governments in rainforest countries, and the Norwegian government, as is reflected in their laws, policies, and positions. The RFN Strategy identifies that target groups for RFN's international policy work are national governments, national delegations to relevant international negotiations, international finance institutions, international bodies and institutions dealing with rainforest management, organizations working with the rights of indigenous peoples and forest certification, nature conservation organizations, development organizations and selected investment funds and private actors. RFN confirm in their Strategy that influencing the climate negotiations will be fundamental for achieving strategic goals and strategy target groups include work in Norway

targeting the political leadership, members of parliament, political parties, and governmental institutions.

RFN is a lead organization amongst civil society working at the international level on land use related issues in the UNFCCC and those interviewees with awareness of this acknowledge that RFN have a lot of credibility in the process. RFN is also one of the founders of the Climate, Land, Ambition and Rights Alliance (CLARA), and was also a founding partner of the REDD+ Safeguards Working Group (RSWG), the Geneva Group and the Ecosystems Climate Alliance (ECA) all of which RFN partners, mostly HuMa have also engaged. We are informed that RFN's concerns are 'heard' by the Norwegian Government, which has been a crucial government in the REDD+ negotiations, especially on the topic of safeguards and reference to environmental integrity in the body of the Paris Agreement and reference to human rights in its preamble, however some say that Norway did oppose the inclusion of Human Rights in the operational text of the Agreement. Unfortunately, representatives of the Indonesian delegation to the UNFCCC have been unresponsive to requests for interview, from whom we would obtain valuable insights into the effectiveness of RFN partner organizations in the UNFCCC negotiations.

It is recognized, and to some extent, expected that RFN's strong relationship with the government of Norway can contribute in terms of putting pressure on the Indonesian government from the Norwegian government. RFN played a central role in putting issues associated with Rainforest protection, such as rights and tenure at the core of Norway's priorities in Indonesia and in the early stages of the Letter of Intent (2010) provided a significant amount of advice. Since the Norwegian Embassy has strengthened its own capacity related to rainforest protection, the role of RFN and their partners as advisory to the Embassy has decreased. Hence, there appears to be little connectivity between RFN and their partners and the Norwegian Embassy in Indonesia. Further, there has not been any need for the Embassy to undertake any interventions or step in for 'damage control' as a result of any RFN funded projects.

RFN's advocacy strategy, targets Norwegian decision makers and seeks to ensure they are guided by high- quality, relevant information about the rainforest and the rights of its peoples and ensuring that the Norwegian government puts human rights, including the rights of forest dependent peoples, at the core of its policies and practices is a key task. The RFN report to NORAD identified that the organization has repeatedly made use of information from their partners in order to advise decision makers in Norway and internationally.

It is important to note that interviewees consider there is added value of the engagement of RFN in Indonesia due to the relationship between the Governments of Norway and Indonesia. Whilst RFN themselves financially support 11 Indonesian CSOs, the Norwegian Government are currently supporting 29 organizations in Indonesia. Through their work RFN are recognized as being in the unique position to support work that cannot be directly supported by the Norwegian Government for different reasons. There is however no clear or organized structure or arrangement that exists between the Norwegian Government and RFN related to their respective roles. Both actors do however have a similar way of working, for example by lacking in visibility in their work in order to support country ownership, and not always taking credit for their achievements.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION IN NEW RFN STRATEGY

RFN's main funding for work in Indonesia comes from a long-term agreement with the civil society mechanism at Norad. The current long-term agreement between Norad and RFN covers the years 2013-17. By September 2017, RFN has to submit a new long-term proposal to Norad for the period 2018 - 2021. Which partners will be included in this proposal is not yet determined, as it depends largely on the new strategy, now under development.

RFN are well respected for the way in which they place trust in their partners. In this context, it has been recommended by some Partners that the development of the new RFN strategy be undertaken in close collaboration with Partners and through the collection of lessons learnt during this current Strategy. Some Partners have requested that the first draft should be circulated to Indonesian Partners and experts located in country to provide comments and inputs.

Building Institutional Capacity

RFN depends on its partners to achieve its goals. The RFN Strategy considers it a priority to work together with partners to promote rights-based sustainable rainforest management towards governments in all RFN partner countries. The organization seeks to do this through capacity building, including on the international legal framework and related advocacy work. The NORAD Project states that when it comes to sharing of knowledge, there is a big potential in creating opportunities for less experienced partners to learn from the more experienced one and recognizes that the capacity strengthening in administrative and financial management is an integral part of RFN's support. Partners consider that RFN's strength and potential lies in its dedication to work with local organizations and build the broader movement.

Strengthening institutional capacity was perhaps the major issue raised in multiple interviews. This is also one area that donors are placing increasing emphasis, for example we are informed that the Ford Foundation will allocate significant funding towards institutional building of 5 selected CSOs in the countries in which they work, and we understand this includes at least one partner of RFN, namely, AMAN. Many interviewees have recommended that RFN place more emphasis on support to build financial management capacity of partners in their new strategy as organizations or other consultants that can assist with this type of work are very limited in Indonesia. Whilst some have mentioned that RFN do not place sufficient emphasis on building capacity of this nature others have praised RFN for their readiness to be flexible and prepared to support overhead costs over and above funding for activities.

By way of example, AMAN has grown considerably and as programmes expand, more staff are required and more complications emerge. It is necessary that organisations have the capacity and support to build the management and fiduciary systems they need. Financial management is difficult and complex and is especially complicated when dealing with communities and informal economies. As a success story on this issue, including now having adequate systems in place to access funding direct from NICFI, one suggestion that has been made is that one of the roles that AMAN could play, is to assist communities they work with to manage their own funds and assist in building the fiduciary capacity of the local organizations. Partners are encouraged by RFN to develop their technical and organizational capacity and competence during project implementation and resources are made available for this purpose, as well as for contributing to covering core costs.

A further example to highlight the importance of enhancing institutional and fiduciary capacity can be drawn from recent experiences with HuMa. Challenges associated with

financial management have had a detrimental impact on the organization, including reputational harm, which in turn is likely to have a detrimental impact on the communities, which depend on the organization as well as those individuals associated with the organisation. Whether a greater supervisory role of RFN or other donors would have made any difference in this scenario is beyond the scope of this evaluation, however it does highlight an important gap that should be filled as soon as possible. As RFN considers itself a 'partner' to organizations in Indonesia, and not a donor, it may be a logical support role the organization could take and the NORAD Project recognizes that the best way to mitigate the risk of weak organisations is capacity building and institutional strengthening, and goes on to say this is a core component of the programme. A balance is required however to ensure the correct balance is met between avoiding over-dependency on one donor, and an organization becoming self sufficient through multiple sources of funding.

On the subject of organizational independence, one interviewee perceives two of the smaller RFN Partners as mere RFN 'extensions' run by workers who implement proposals and with little ability to think more strategically, and are unable to have critical discussion with RFN. The issue of partner organizations being mere 'puppets' of RFN or even of the Norwegian Government's agenda in Indonesia has been raised by some interviewees, and one example of where the issue appears to have been highlighted is at the time of the dismantling of the REDD+ Agency based on a request from RFN to all Partners to express a negative, united public view on the subject through the press. We are informed that some Partners felt they were being told what position they should take and we understand this press conference and united position against the dismantling of the REDD+ Agency did not occur.

Assistance with understanding of potential donors has also been mentioned as an area where collaboration can improve and such scoping exercises should be perceived as investments. It has been suggested that RFN should support the development of a consortium for fundraising for local organizations and a mechanism to share information concerning fundraising and other matters. It is well known that donors change their priorities and can easily cease providing funds and where partners do not have adequate multiple sources of funds and do not have an adequate understanding of donor priorities, including when donors are going through processes of reprioritizing, this creates financial risks for partners. This risk may be mitigated by, for example establishing trust funds within organizations, through which staff are required to make contributions, which result in lower financial remuneration for staff and potentially higher turnover and loss of talent. Organizations need some level of flexible funding to undertake these 'scoping exercises' and support to secure new funds to grow and improve and become truly independent and sustainable.

It is mentioned that the administrative requirement of RFN itself in terms of reporting are not overly onerous, which is one of the strengths and added values of the organization and enable access to funds that may not otherwise occur. However it is recognized that in more recent times the reporting requirements of RFN have become more onerous and quantitative, requiring details such as carbon reductions in tonnes and numbers of livelihood improvements. These reporting requirements are challenging for some partners and create anxieties out of concern that organizations may be punished for inadvertently over or understating these numbers. Assistance from RFN on what is expected has been sought and it would be useful to do so, as this is a trend that is not limited to RFN and would be an important strength of RFN partners.

The NORAD Project states that in Indonesia, the position of traditional forest communities is very weak. It says that through alternative education and organizational

support, RFN has contributed to strengthening forest peoples' position. The RFN Strategy concerning Indonesia identifies that civil society in both Papua and West Papua is weaker than in the rest of Indonesia. Finding competent local organizations and high-skilled staff is difficult. As a result, projects in Papua and West Papua must invest in capacity building, and they require very close follow up from RFN. The NORAD Project states that in Papua and West Papua, RFN has invested in building the capacity of partner organisations and investments are said to be already paying off in terms of increased partner professionalism. Going forward, it will be important for RFN to build on the long history of engagement of the likes of well respect and knowledgeable individuals such as Øyvind Sandbukt to engage with local level partners and contribute to building effective national / sub national coordination.

Building Capacity for International Engagement

The RFN Advocacy Strategy includes actions to strengthen the ability of civil society to pressure their governments and international institutions to apply a rights-based approach to sustainable rainforest management and to strengthen the knowledge and capacity of local partners. The most important areas for this cooperation have been identified as: promoting local rights-based rainforest management as an efficient development model for development aid and international financing institutions; and strengthen indigenous peoples' rights within the framework of the UN. The RFN strategy seeks to ensure that information on risks and opportunities at the international level is channeled to the partners, allowing them to utilize the momentum of events such as high-level political visits to convey their concerns and demands.

The lack of understanding of linkages and relevance of international processes to work at the national and sub national level is consistently a challenge, which is heightened in Indonesia due to communication and language barriers. RFN has played a long-standing important role in terms of ensuring partner organizations from Indonesia attend and engage in the UNFCCC negotiations. Interviewees have identified that this linkage between the international and the national needs to be clear and strategic and that the engagement in the international processes should be intended to complement and support the work being undertaken at the national and sub national level. It would appear at this point that the link is not clear to many of RFN's partners. Further, it should be noted that Indonesia is an increasingly important country in the UNFCCC and is also a country that takes its international obligations, and reputation seriously, hence international pressure can impact national policy.

Since the Paris Agreement was entered into, much discussion has turned now to its implementation. Countries are developing and submitting their NDCs, including Indonesia, and REDD-plus continues to progress with recent decisions made concerning results based payments at the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Indonesian colleagues attending UNFCCC meetings and working amongst networks such as CLARA and the RSWG have been on a high turnover and those who do attend are often overwhelmed by the complexities of the information. Interviewees have suggested that this problem be remedied through enhanced engagement during the course of the year, including between meetings and more consistency in terms of attendance and engagement at these meetings.

Capacity needs to be built within Indonesia on the matters under negotiation through workshops that explore ways to make the international processes relevant to work at the national and sub national level. Support for English language training amongst Indonesia CSOs is said to also be useful in this context. It has been suggested that RFN partners should engage more on the topics and that CLARA could consider a capacity

building or mentoring programme both in between and during conferences. Such a program could assist partners to identify the linkages, undertake a more strategic engagement at the international level and improve coordination and collaboration at the national level.

Improving collaboration

Several interviewees mentioned there to be a need for enhanced collaboration amongst the partners of RFN, and more broadly especially between those working at the national level and those working at the sub national level. It was observed by one senior (non partner) interviewee that the Indonesian CSOs lack a strong coordinated common national strategy and tend to be overly rigid despite a rapidly changing, dynamic environment around them. This rigidity associated with local organizations is no doubt linked to their funding, projects and programmes. It should be noted that the RFN Advocacy Strategy says the organization will building common strategies with partners and allies to ensure that REDD+ mechanisms are based in the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, protect biodiversity, respect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, and contribute to reducing global greenhouse gas emissions

It is said by interviewees that improved collaboration would improve the effectiveness of the efforts, especially where work undertaken at the national level can support efforts undertaken at the sub national level. Also, sub national understandings can better inform the work undertaken at the national and international level and it has been recommended that national organizations should be encouraged to take up issues raised by sub national organizations more often.

Partners are not seeing the strategic links between the sub national groups or the national groups. Enhanced collaboration of this nature would also ensure a more efficient use of resources through improved peer to peer learning. Although there is no expectation that all organizations would develop one single strategy, and each have their own different objectives, improved identification as to where efforts can be undertaken in a strategic and coordinated manner with a common goal is considered preferable, and is already included in the RFN strategy.

Enhanced collaboration should not be limited to only CSOs. It has also been recommended that there should be greater collaboration with research organisations such as CIFOR in Indonesia to gain better access to new research and also better collaboration with donors active in Indonesia, such as CLUA and the Norwegian Government. The RFN Strategy recognizes that close relations with relevant research communities are important to ensure access to information and cutting-edge research findings, however it is not evident as to how this is undertaken in practice.

The question as to how this could be done was raised and it was recommended that there is a need to gain a better understanding about what each organization is doing and where strengths exist and RFN would benefit from sitting together with local partners more often to understand and define what is and is not significant. Enhanced collaboration could also come from holding more partner meetings as well as workshops and other convening events to bring people together, foster relationships and build trust.

Engagement with the private sector

The issue of corporate pledges related to zero deforestation and sustainable supply

chains has been raised as being incredibly important and RFN has recently engaged on the topic concerning companies Astra Agro Lestari (AAL) and Indofood Agri. It is recognized that it is now the time for those involved to focus on implementation and verification on these pledges. The groups that are known to be mostly involved in this work are Greenpeace, RAN, FPP, AMAN, Aid Environment, Kemitraan, Sawit Watch and WALHI amongst others. Related to these corporate pledges are issues concerning transparency, independent monitoring and linkages between business and human rights. RFN's report to NORAD notes that significant developments have taken place within the private sector, with more and more companies adopting zero-deforestation policies. RFN point out in this report that they have played a key role in pushing some of the major palm oil companies in this direction, likely referring to their work related to AAL.

On the topic of corporate pledges and transnational companies putting in place increased environmental sustainability criteria, several organisations in Indonesia, some of which are RFN partners have played a central role in achieving these pledges, including the Indonesian Palm Oil Pledge (IPOP). For example AMAN signed on to the New York Declaration for Forests. Other organizations such as Sawit Watch and CIFOR have played an important role highlighting the potential for these pledges to be having negative impacts on smallholder farmers and are developing a comprehensive online interactive map linking forest loss to companies. Independent monitoring of these pledges and progress being made is becoming increasingly important.

Progress related to these pledges has been recognized as very slow and questions are increasingly being asked as to whether progress is being made at all, how to measure progress and to what extent companies are falsely representing or 'greenwashing' on the topic. The IPOP is considered by many to be 'dead'. This lack of systematic monitoring and reporting, especially in the context of climate change gives rise to important issues related to transparency. It is important to enhance understanding of whether these companies are doing what they say they are doing and for monitoring to be undertaken, including monitoring of the impacts on smallholders as well as their market linkages and their participation in the supply chain. It has been pointed out by one interviewee with extensive expertise in this area, that in many circumstances, these companies do not have sufficient control over their own supply chain to be achieving these pledges.

Further, as the BRG will be undertaking their work in many concession areas, enhanced independent monitoring of these efforts and the actions taken by companies is also required.

Other

Gender: The RFN Strategy seeks to enhance gender integration and states that gender should not be a subject on its own, but a perspective with which to view one's work. RFN acknowledge that women often are primary forest users and seeks to ensure their participation at all levels of their work. The RFN strategy confirms the organizations commitment in its partnerships with local organizations to promote gender equality and sensitivity and will promote increased participation of women in policy arenas, with a view to ensuring that women's specific interests and knowledge regarding the management and preservation of forest resources are addressed in policy- and decision-making processes. It has been suggested by partners that RFN put more attention to women as key stewards of the rainforest and to do so by increasing partners working with women and ensuring women are involved in participatory mapping efforts. Although Perempuan AMAN and other members of Asia Indigenous Women Network

have begun to gain traction, the movement in Indonesia remains weak and there is no coordinated national strategy amongst CSOs working on women's issues linked with natural resources exploitation. We note that Perempuan AMAN is one of the major recipients in RFN's CFI Program, which is a positive development and well aligned with an international increasing emphasis on inclusion of gender in projects, for example gender is now being streamlined throughout all GCF projects.

Enhanced emphasis on Victimization of Local People, including CSOs: as shifting cultivation is against the law in Indonesia, many IPs undertaking this practice traditionally become subject to criminal proceedings, including imprisonment. Further, conservation models that 'lock out' people continue to be implemented and may increase due to the pressures to restore ecosystems and plant forests to mitigate climate change. It has been suggested that RFN increase emphasis on the traditional practices of indigenous peoples through international and national processes and place emphasis on the victimization and criminalization of these practices. It has been recommended that RFN support capacity building initiatives for communities who confront 'threats', and a mapping of such threats should be undertaken.

Next generation: Some concerns have been expressed that there are very few new entrants to the CSO movement in Indonesia. Often, individuals spent a short time working with a CSO as a bridge to obtain experience and then move on. It has been suggested that RFN consider investing in ways to attract new entrants and how to ensure they perceive working in CSOs as a long-term career path and such initiatives as the Lipu / Customary Community School is one good example. It has been said that there is currently no regeneration of NGOs in Papua and that the NGO movement is dead with an over reliance on outsiders, which is further marginalizing local peoples. Consistent with this observation, CLUA identify that there is a huge gap between senior and junior activists in Papua, which is possibly attributed to lack of funding and lack of engagement by donors. It has been suggested that a dedicated coordination forum be established for organizations working on/for Papua, where they can pull resources together (funding & skills), and develop a shared workplan.

Legal Emphasis: There is an increasing emphasis on legal strategies both in Indonesia and more broadly internationally related to environment, human rights and climate change. AMAN are currently building a stronger legal presence and discussions are emerging related to potential cases to address issues such as peatland fires and haze. However, should there be increased emphasis on litigation strategies, long term sustainable funding will be required. It may also be necessary for RFN to expand its partner base and include more legal organizations. Further, it was mentioned that legislation needs to be put in place to properly implement MK35 and legal resources are required to advocate around this.

The 'restoration' agenda: As there will be an increased emphasis on ecosystem restoration and reforestation as a means of implementing the Paris Agreement, it has been recommended that RFN keep a close watch on developments around the issue of 'restoration' and the potential social impacts, including denial of rights of access and ensure a rights based approach to ecosystem restoration, reforestation and other efforts to rely on the land sector for climate mitigation and adaptation. Going forward, it is becoming increasingly important to emphasize rights in the context of what may be preferable climate solutions such as ecosystem restoration.

Implementation: new activities have been suggested designed to 'test the operationalization' of some of the more recent policies being put in place, and less

advocacy. For example, outcomes from MK35, various perda, Permen ATR IP4T, and Village Law.

GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATIONS

The section of the RFN Strategy concerning choice of location and focus states that RFN give priority to size on the basis that this is a key criterion for maintaining ecosystem services and for the rainforest to be sustainable. RFN recognize that smaller areas may also be of vital importance to local people, be it habitat for endemic or rare species or it may contain an exceptional degree of biodiversity. Choice of an area of focus may be in order to defend the rights and culture of a particular ethnic group, their forest area may gain high priority for RFN even though it may not be exceptional in purely biological terms. RFN seek to find a balance between projects in the field and projects to improve the national and international politico-legal framework for the rainforest and its peoples.

The current geographical priorities in RFN's strategy are as follows

1. Papua and West Papua: These two provinces are a priority region because of their very high remaining forest cover and the difficult human rights situation for forest peoples. The strategy notes that Papua and West Papua are characterized by a tense political situation that puts indigenous peoples in peril. However, RFN see political opportunities for working there because of the newly introduced local autonomy over forest resources.
2. Kalimantan: Kalimantan still has vast areas of rainforest. Central Kalimantan is the pilot province under the bilateral REDD agreement between Norway and Indonesia. RFN consider this to be an opportunity to protect the remaining forest in the province, and makes RFN's presence politically strategic.
3. Sumatra: RFNs work to protect the vulnerable communities and rainforest areas in Jambi and the Mentawai Islands will continue because of the political momentum created in these locations through many years of work. Efforts will be made to halt the devastation of the last remaining rainforests of Sumatra through establishing projects in other areas that still have a chance of being saved.

Some discussions emerged during the interviews related to whether there should be any emphasis on one geographic area over another, to identify that RFN is working in the 'right' places. Working in Papua was consistently raised due to the extensive intact natural forests in the area coupled with the high rate of deforestation, whilst it has also been mentioned that smaller islands are now becoming the target of industry as resources become more scarce on the larger islands. Areas such as Aru and Mentawai have been mentioned and concerns expressed that no donors are looking to these areas.

More specifically on the subject of Papua, caution has been expressed that enhanced engagement in Papua does carry risks due to the current political issues in the area. This is recognized in the RFN Strategy, which identifies that a key challenge of RFN's work in West Papua is to influence debates and decisions regarding forest management without being seen to take side in the political dissension. The RFN Strategy recognizes that there are restrictions on the freedom of movement for foreigners in Papua and West Papua, creating extra challenges for RFN's involvement in the region. Interviewees however generally accept that there is a great deal of work to be done in Papua and West Papua and seem supportive of the work already ongoing in the region supported by RFN. It has been expressed that RFN need to avoid charity or preferential treatment towards any partners on the basis that this tends to weaken than empower. This issue

arose from a concern that some NGOs with less capacity have received funding due to their location in Papua, over other NGOs in other parts of Indonesia that have more capacity. The evaluators have not reviewed proposals of partners or the differences in capacity and do question the extent to which this level of detail is well known amongst partners. We do however consider this an important issue to ensure remains 'on the radar' and that it is important that RFN is aware that some, perhaps unhealthy competition for resources is occurring.

It was recommended that the best strategy for an organization like RFN, when focusing on Papua should be to work directly with organizations in Papua and enable them to take the lead. For example, AMAN plays a supportive role and not a leading role in the area, which has been successful. Caution has been expressed that to bring in outsiders, either international or from Jakarta, further marginalizes local organizations and drains resources that could be otherwise allocated to the region. An interesting dynamic identified by one interviewee is that Papuan NGOs are more likely to trust international NGOs than Indonesian NGOs. Further, as mentioned above, it has been stated by more than one partner that the NGO movement in Papua is 'dead' and there is no regeneration, and this challenge appears to the evaluators to hold some urgency and importance.

Further, of note, CLUA intends to put in place more work in Papua and had initially avoided the area due to the complexities associated with the politics and the lack of fiduciary capacity of many organisations based there. Should RFN decide to focus more on Papua, this may be a useful complement as well as a useful channel for exchange of information and learnings.

It has been expressed by one interviewee that RFN should not be deterred by the fact that other international NGOs' have been 'thrown out' of Papua. It has been recommended that RFN should build rapport with KLHK and the local governments in Papua and sustainable development should not be a controversial theme in Papua. Building local support should be more sustainable than being under 'protection' of GoI – Norway LoI. Furthermore, RFN should be caution to avoid 'putting all eggs in one basket' of Papua, due to the risks.

VISIBILITY

As previously mentioned, the lack of visibility of RFN in Indonesia, including that there is no RFN office in the country was seen by most as being one of the value added attributes of the organization as this supports country ownership of initiatives and strengthens local organizations. Further, the RFN report to NORAD mentions that the organisation abstains from building Rainforest Foundation branches in rainforest countries, believing that the strengthening of genuine representatives of the target country's civil society is essential for democratic development and long-term sustainability. RFN are however concerned that the geographic challenges of being based in Oslo are potentially detrimental to their work, especially on the subject of assisting with capacity building and organizational strengthening.

On the topic as to whether RFN should take steps to establish an office in Indonesia, the majority of interviewees did not support the idea, suggesting it would be 'un-strategic' out of concerns that this could take away resources from existing CSOs. Colleagues in Papua made the point that it could result in expulsion from the area on the basis of being a 'foreign critical voice'. There is a real risk of foreign NGOs being 'thrown out' of the country and should RFN establish a local office, it would need to be certain that an incident of this nature would not undermine the ability of the organization, or its

partners to achieve their own objectives. One interviewee said that RFN campaigns should remain focused in the North, while partners in Indonesia provide technical assistance to RFN eg as political advisors, forest & climate advisors, actor analysts on matters in Indonesia, and said all those working in Indonesia should only be Indonesians. We note that the work of RFN in Indonesia has been highly successful without the organisation opening an office in the country.

There has also been positive views expressed supporting more presence of RFN in Indonesia. It has been said that under the current operating model, RFN is not perceived as a threat to companies, who are 'protected' by the State. An Indonesian presence may change the relationship between RFN and the State on this issue. It has been suggested that the experience of other international organisations such as Greenpeace or WWF can inform RFN, however the organization should remain steadfast in ensuring it engages very closely with local partners in any advocacy work done in Indonesia. Some mentioned that it would be useful in terms of having easier access to representatives of the organization and should RFN be seeking to enhance their own direct engagement in policy it would be useful.

The majority of interviewees considered it to be a matter for RFN to decide on for themselves and that an alternative may be to have a full time person undertaking the role of an intermediary / 'go to' person, without establishing a legal entity in Indonesia and / or provide more support to building local capacity, including a training programme for activists and lobbyists. Further, on the topic of assisting further with capacity building efforts, this could be done through support 'in house' within RFN partners without needing an RFN office.

CONCLUSIONS

RFN is a world leading, well organized and highly respected NGO, which successfully supports indigenous peoples and traditional populations of the world's rainforests in their efforts to protect their environment and fulfill their rights. RFN effectively assists national and sub national organizations in Indonesia to make progress towards securing and controlling the natural resources necessary for the long-term well-being of these communities and to protect their individual and collective rights. RFN's main programme goal is to 'achieve the implementation of rights based sustainable management in significant areas of Indonesia by 2017'.

Very Significant progress has been made towards achieving this goal, especially with the decision by President Jokowi in December 2016 to recognize ** areas as *hutan adat* (customary forest). RFN are urged by major partners to continue to carry on with the current themes and continue to focus on rights-based forest protection as well as developing sustainable livelihood of local communities.

RFN's partners, recipients of RFN funding, have been instrumental and led the way in Indonesia in opening the path towards achieving the Programme Goal. RFN support for Indonesian NGOs has contributed to a critical, and likely sustainable paradigm shift impact in the country in how CSOs and government communicate. Through their strategic REDD+ related advocacy, there has been an increased space for the participation of civil society in a country where this has been known to, at times, be restricted, challenging and dangerous. RFN are most widely recognized and respected for this important and unique role in strengthening civil society in Indonesia on rights and forest issues.

The RFN Programme ‘part goal’ to support NGOs, indigenous peoples’ organizations and forest based communities to have the capacity to advocate for rights-based sustainable rainforest management in a coordinated and strategic manner is core to their work, and well recognized. This is achieved through multiple channels, including provision of support for legal drafting skills, which have proven effective in assisting partners to have impact and influence on policy development through preparation and analyses of bills and other documentation. For example AMAN have prepared the Bill on the Recognition and Protection of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This capacity building extends to the establishment of *adat* through the Customary Community School, known as the “Lipu School”, noting that training, skills development and education are efficient and important ways of ensuring sustainable outcomes and preventing creation of generational gaps.

Building capacity of organizations engaged in day-to-day work in Indonesia, does come with very significant challenges due to the complex environment and the dynamic circumstances in which they are operating. Preferences, priorities and agendas shift and with these shifts can come negative impacts on organizations creating an imbalance in the way this support plays out on the ground. For example, AMAN has consistently grown and is undoubtedly the most influential indigenous rights advocates in the country, however, more recently HuMa has reduced in size and therefore capacity. The question should be raised as to how one partner organization can grow so much in recent years, whilst another does not.

Further, it would appear on the face of the documentation provided that RFN may discontinue support for some partner organizations. We base this observation on our review of the CFI Programme, which includes funding for four organizations only, one of which is called ‘miscellaneous organization’ as well as information received from RFN that any ongoing funding will be required to align with RFN’s new strategy. We are informed that concept notes will be sought from selected organizations in early March 2017, and decisions will be made as to what projects and partners are most relevant for RFN given the new strategy, and will then be included in RFN’s new proposal to Norad for the period 2018 – 2021. The current RFN NORAD Project states that exit strategies are developed individually for the projects to guarantee the best possible support based on the needs and situation of the partners. The Project states that these exit strategies are realized through a *several year* period of phasing out with decreasing financial support but strong emphasis on supporting partners in their attempts to gain increased independence and secure the continuation of the organization and its work. We are informed that any such exit strategies will more likely be over a 1, or 2 year maximum period, and we would recommend that RFN consider whether this timeframe is sufficient.

Strengthening institutional capacity was a major issue raised in multiple interviews. Many interviewees have recommended that RFN place more emphasis on this in their new strategy as organizations that can assist with this type of work are very limited in Indonesia. As RFN considers itself a ‘partner’ to organizations in Indonesia, and not a donor, it would be an effective and efficient use of resources. RFN itself recognizes that the best way to mitigate the risk of weak organizations is capacity building and institutional strengthening. Such assistance should include increased emphasis on building fiduciary capacity within organizations and assistance with understanding of the landscape of potential donors and securing diversity in funding sources to underpin the sustainability of the work. This support should not only be focused on smaller, newer organizations, but also on organizations as they grow, especially in circumstances where a partner encounters challenges associated with that growth, and assist them to move to the ‘next level’.

Further, the RFN Strategy identifies that civil society in both Papua and West Papua is weaker than in the rest of Indonesia requiring more capacity building and close follow up and monitoring. Papua is an increasing area of focus for organizations and donors, including RFN however, caution has been expressed that enhanced engagement in Papua does carry risks due to the current political issues in the area. It is generally recognized that there is a great deal of work to be done in Papua and West Papua and partners seem supportive of the work already ongoing in the region supported by RFN.

The Programme 'part goals' seek to contribute to the development of legal instruments and policies protecting rainforest areas while respecting the rights of forest based communities. They seek to strengthen the rights of indigenous peoples and forest based communities in legal instruments on relevant levels of government, and apply effective measures such as law enforcement, transparency, participation and reform. The RFN Advocacy Strategy seeks to ensure that partner organizations in Southeast Asia, have *substantially* influenced national policies and local decision-making. It is however difficult to attribute policy reform in Indonesia directly to RFN without undertaking a more detailed analyses and impact assessment, which distinguishes between RFN funded projects and those funded by other donors to RFN partners.

The highest profile impact, which can be partly attributed to RFN support for Indonesian CSOs during the period of the evaluation relates to the Constitutional Court decision concerning customary forest (MK35) and the subsequent Presidential recognition of ** areas as *hutan adat* in December 2016. The impact of MK35 on the ground, which is considerable, continues to be felt and has resulted in an increase in communities claiming customary entitlements to land, some of which are succeeded. RFN partners have also succeeded in having the President Jokowi include measures to ensure the respect of indigenous peoples in his political priority agenda. However, ongoing challenges associated with securing customary land ownership in some of these areas remain, and the processes being put in place are overly complex and difficult with local level bottlenecks, which has caused delays in its implementation. Legal outcomes of this nature are extremely high impact, effective and efficient use of resources and both RFN and their partners should be applauded for these extraordinary achievements and we would encourage resources being applied to building on this work to scale up *hutan adat* recognition throughout Indonesia in the new strategy.

The MK35 decision also highlights the importance of mapping and titling indigenous territories. There have been several effective measures taken in the context of mapping including participatory mapping of the territories of ten communities undertaken by Walhi Kalteng, and Paradisea have enabled participatory mapping in 3 areas. Mapping has also been undertaken by YMP, YCMM and Warsi and AMAN have succeeded in having indigenous territories included in the One Map initiative.

A barrier however to achieving the Programme Goal has been the stagnation and almost complete stalling of REDD+ implementation. Significant investments had been made by RFN in the REDD+ agency, the One Map initiative, safeguards monitoring and benefit sharing mechanisms, however the dismantling of the Agency under Jokowi has given rise to uncertainties as to whether these investments have been an efficient use of resources. RFN note in their report to NORAD that this near stagnation in REDD+ initiatives has made the full achievement of the outcome indicators difficult. RFN should consider the flexibility or rigidity of their strategies and it is useful when seeking to influence policy to ensure built in flexibility to programmes to enable rapid adaptation to changes, especially changes of government.

RFN has played a long-standing and important role in relation to international policy advocacy work and the engagement of Indonesian partners in international processes. RFN is a lead organization amongst global civil society on land use related issues in the UNFCCC and is also one of the founders of the Climate, Land, Ambition and Rights Alliance (CLARA). However, there remains a gap in knowledge and linking of international processes to national policy this needs to be made more clear and strategic to ensure international engagement complements and is relevant to national and sub national level priorities. There should be more emphasis on building capacity amongst Indonesian partners on the complexities and subject matter of international negotiations as well as improve coordination at the national level and sub national levels. Further, as RFN is a major partner of networks focused on the implementation of indigenous peoples rights, strengthening of relationships between IP networks and other CSOs working at the UNFCCC could be improved.

RFN partners seek greater collaboration and for a clear common national strategy that ensures work being undertaken at the national and international level is relevant to the work at the sub national level. Such a strategy would need to be flexible and designed to function within the dynamic Indonesian policy environment. Current levels of collaboration are considered to be weak with a lack of connectivity amongst the NGOs. Such a lacking in collaboration may be creating an inefficient use of resources. It has been expressed that enhanced collaboration would strengthen the work at the national level, which would then in turn, have the effect of strengthening the work at the sub national level. RFN are said to be the only organization in a position to have a full understanding of the scope of work of each of the individual organizations and one way to resolve this concern maybe to increase the number of partner meetings held each year. This lack of connectivity across the partners of RFN also makes it challenging to identify the overall impact of the work being undertaken throughout Indonesia.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, people are very positive about the work being undertaken by RFN in Indonesia and consider the organization to be doing important and highly relevant work, are effective and remain consistently focused on the most important issues over the long term, and in this context, we make the following recommendations:

- 1. A further analyses enabling additional interviews, further exploration and verification of some topics and further review of the current findings should be undertaken in the early part of 2017*
- 2. A further analyses and evaluation should be undertaken which distinguishes between projects undertaken by RFN partners on funding received from RFN from funding received from other donors in order to gain a more accurate understanding of RFNs impact*
- 3. Where RFN is taking steps to cease funding for any partners, appropriate exit strategies consistent with the RFN Strategy and NORAD project should be put in place*
- 4. RFN should be cautious not to automatically apply methods and lessons, which have succeeded in one part of Indonesia to another area due to social, political and environmental differences and complexities across the country*

5. *RFN should continue to carry on with current themes and continue to focus on rights-based forest protection plus developing sustainable livelihood of local communities*
6. *RFN should be cautious not to allow their work in Indonesia to become overly focused on indigenous peoples to the exclusion of local communities and smallholder farmers, who, as noted in the RFN strategy depend on the use of forest resources and are included in RFNs work in various ways*
7. *RFN should ensure that their partners are seeking both hutan desa and hutan adat and for each partners to assess the effectiveness and efficiencies of the different alternatives on a case by case basis*
8. *RFN should undertake an assessment concerning the current political circumstances related to the One Map policy and check the accuracy as to whether this initiative has been rolled back to only be applicable to the peatlands restoration agenda or whether it continues to have a broader application.*
9. *RFN should ensure that flexibility is built into its strategies to put in place measures to review and revise their efforts with more responsiveness in circumstances of political change.*
10. *RFN should ensure their new Strategy considers how their efforts can both support Indonesia's NDC implementation as well as pressures the Indonesian Government to increase its ambition wherever possible*
11. *RFN should enhance their efforts to strengthen local institutions, in particular their financial and fiduciary management systems as well as their technical and organizational capacity and competence during project implementation and continue to contribute to covering core costs.*
12. *RFN should develop their new strategy in close collaboration with Indonesian CSOs with whom they work, including through consultations and provision of drafts for comment as they are developed.*
13. *RFN should consider the development of a consortium for fundraising for local organizations and a mechanism to share information concerning fundraising and other matters as a means of decreasing dependence solely on RFN funding and enhancing organizational independence and long-term sustainability.*
14. *RFN should provide additional assistance to partners on what is expected in terms of more onerous quantified reporting requirements that are in place as well as other financial management capacity of partners.*
15. *RFN should ensure continued investments in capacity building in Papua and West Papua together with close monitoring*
16. *RFN should enhance engagement during the course of the year through workshops on UNFCCC policy, including the GCF, through capacity building between meetings and more consistency in terms of attendance and engagement at these meetings.*
17. *RFN should spearhead a capacity building and mentoring programme within the CLARA both between and during UNFCCC meetings*

18. *RFN should put in place measures to enable the development and implementation of a national collaborative strategy with common goals amongst its partners, especially where work undertaken at the national level can support efforts undertaken at the sub national level and vice versa*
19. *RFN should consider increasing the number of partner meetings in order to enhance collaboration, sharing of information and ensuring work undertaken at the national level can support efforts undertaken at the sub national level and vice versa*
20. *RFN should put in place measures to enhance engagement with research institutes as a means to inform and support the efforts of their partners*
21. *RFN should enhance their engagement in Indonesia through additional partner meetings as well as workshops and other convening events to bring people together, foster relationships and build trust*
22. *Whilst RFN should continue its emphasis on private sector and finance, considerations should be given to issues such as the impact of zero deforestation and sustainable supply chain commitments on smallholder farmers, transparency and monitoring of the implementation of these commitments*
23. *RFN should consider the following additional areas for enhanced action in their new strategy: gender; emphasis on victimization of local communities; support the next generation of activists; emphasis on legal initiatives; risks associated with the 'restoration agenda'; and impacts associated with implementation of new policies*
24. *RFN should undertake a scoping study on the potential interventions and impacts on smaller islands in Indonesia, including Aru and Mentawai, arising from expansion and depleting resources on the larger islands to gain an understanding of possible outcomes and gains that could be derived that would benefit rainforests more generally*
25. *Specific sensitivities associated with engagement in Papua and West Papua should be taken into consideration by RFN, including ensuring local organizations take the lead, outsiders undertaking work in the region are limited and the generation gap amongst environmental activists is closed*
26. *RFN should maintain its position and abstain from building Rainforest Foundation branches in Indonesia at this point in time.*

ANNEX 1: GUIDING QUESTIONS

ON RFN's IMPACT

1. What do you know about RFN's work in Indonesia?
2. What would you say is RFN's main contribution to forest protection and tenure reform in Indonesia?
3. What is your impression of RFN's relationship with their local partners?
4. To what extent has RFN contributed to strengthening the civil society in Indonesia? And which organisations?
5. What do you think differentiates RFN with other international NGOs working with Indonesia, if any? What is the added value that RFN has in terms of the civil society landscape in Indonesia?
6. To what extent do you think RFN has achieved its goals?

On RFN's new strategy (2018-22)

1. Given an overall aim of protecting large areas of rainforest through a rights-based approach, where would you recommend RFN puts its efforts and resources over the next five-ten years? What different strategy/approach would you recommend, if any?
2. Should RFN focus its efforts on particular geographic regions? If so, why?
3. Should RFN focus its efforts more on legal matters including law enforcement, investigations into corruption conflicts of interest and corporate accountability?
4. Should RFN be more focused thematically? If so, on which topics, and why?
5. RFN's Indonesia program has over the years used the majority of its resources on financial support to local partner organizations on Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Papua and in Jakarta. While RFN is very successful with advocacy and campaigning internationally and in Norway, we have taken the backseat in Indonesia and left this kind of work to the partners. Do you think RFN should take a more active and visible role in Indonesia?