

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): CEPF Support of Local Partners Sumatra

Implementation Partners for this Project: Conservation International Indonesia (CII), WWF Indonesia, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), and Ministry of Forestry

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): 1 July 2002-30 April 2005

Date of Report (month/year): June 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

This grant supported CEPF's "eyes and ears" on the ground in the form of the Sumatra Grant Manager based in Jakarta. This position is integral to CEPF's grantmaking in Sumatra, as the Grant Manager spends a large percentage of her time working with applicants and grantees on the ground, assisting them with everything from grant applications to reporting to troubleshooting project implementation. This position assisted CEPF's Washington staff with managing grants provided by CEPF to NGOs in conservation activities in Sumatra in accordance with the Sundaland Ecosystem Profile. This position also worked closely with CEPF lead organizations on Sumatra, which included CI Indonesia, WWF Indonesia and the WCS Indonesia Program.

The Grant Manager spent up to 60% of her time in the field working with CEPF grantees in Sumatra, especially those local NGOs in need of help with project development, implementation and evaluation. The position was based within CI Indonesia and had reporting requirements to the head of CI Indonesia as well as CEPF's Asia Grant Director.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: The purpose of this project was to ensure that civil society in Sumatra at the district level and below successfully accessed CEPF funds and was successfully implementing projects with conservation action in line with CEPF's Sundaland Ecosystem Profile.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
1.1. Civil society in focal areas on Sumatra successfully applies for CEPF funds.	A cross section of civil society in CEPF's four focal areas on Sumatra applied for CEPF funds, and the Grant Manager successfully facilitated development of 60 grants to more than 30 NGOs in Sumatra.
1.2. Civil society is successfully implementing a minimum of five CEPF-funded projects in each of the four focal areas by the end of FY03.	Civil society, represented by NGOs (local and international), universities and private parties, successfully implementing 60 CEPF-funded projects in CEPF's four focal areas by April 2005.
1.3. Major donors return to Indonesia to match at least 25% of CEPF's grants by FY05.	Grant Manager, together with CEPF DC-based team and leading organizations in Sumatra, successfully invited major donors to

	invest in Sumatra (please see attached leveraging table)
1.4. Civil society is able to sustain funding for 100% of its lowland-forest conservation efforts by July 2006.	Not all Civil society has been able to sustain 100% funding for its conservation endeavors. However, CEPF had been successful in inviting other donors to fund specific components of the projects and/or the NGOs and were able to match or increase CEPF investment.

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

The project achieved its intended impact objective and performance indicators. Civil society, represented by international, national and local NGOs, had access to CEPF funding for Sumatra in line with Sumatra Ecosystem profile.

CEPF grantees had not yet been able to achieve sustainable financing for 100% of its lowland-forest conservation efforts, however, CEPF had actively assisted with proposals to help promising grantees apply for follow-on funding from other donors. Overall, as presented in June 2005 at a CEPF meeting with the World Bank in Medan, Indonesia, CEPF helped grantees to fundraise almost 3.5 million USD that matched 4.4. million USD in CEPF investments in eight Sumatra-based projects.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

One unexpected positive outcome of this project was development of the “Flying Team”, which consisted of the heads of the lead organizations, a CI-based technical team and a representative of the Ministry of Forestry. This team helped CEPF grantees reach out to high-ranking government officials to influence their decision making process in favor of conservation in Sumatra. The team also helped CEPF grantees think “bigger” and “outside the box” so as to make more significant impact on the ground. In addition, the Flying Team helped CEPF in managing and resolving conflicts in relation to implementation of partnerships and conservation alliances on the ground.

No negative unexpected impacts were experienced during implementations of this project.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager successfully soliciting and monitoring grants in the four areas of geographic focus on Sumatra.	
1.1. CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager is recruited and hired by July 2002.	CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager was recruited and hired by July 2002. She sat within CI Indonesia and reported to both the Regional VP for CI Indonesia and CEPF’s Asia Grant Director.
1.2. Grant Manager travels to each of the four focal areas (Northern Sumatra, Siberut, Tesso Nilo/Bukit Tigapuluh and Bukit Barisan Selatan)	Grant Manager traveled to each of the four focal areas to assist civil society with grant applications, project planning and monitoring,

<p>a minimum of once per quarter to meet with civil society and assist with all aspects of grant application and implementation.</p>	<p>troubleshooting and fundraising. All 50 trip reports over the life of grant's three years have been filed in CEPF e-rooms.</p>
<p>1.3. Grant Manager solicits and assists in the submissions of a minimum of 12 CEPF grant applications from the four focal areas by June 2003.</p>	<p>Total 167 grant applications were submitted to CEPF from the four focal areas by June 2005.</p>
<p>1.4. Grant Manager facilitates translations (and, when necessary, editing) of CEPF materials, letters of inquiry, grant applications, grant reporting and relevant project products from English to Bahasa and/or Bahasa to English.</p>	<p>All CEPF materials, letters of inquiry, grant applications, grant reporting and relevant project products were available in Bahasa. Grant Manager facilitated and edited the translation process and products.</p>
<p>Output 2: CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager facilitating coordination and cooperation between NGOs in each of the four focal areas.</p>	
<p>2.1. Grant Manager coordinates her activities with those of lead organizations in each of the four focal areas, contacting them in person a minimum of once per quarter.</p>	<p>Grant Manager met with leaders of lead organizations (CII, WWF, and WCS) on a regular basis, at least once a month, to monitor projects in each focal area and provide assistance with troubleshooting.</p> <p>In early 2004, CEPF "Flying Team" concept was developed to assist CEPF in reaching out to the highest levels of relevant political/decision making processes in order to ensure conservation action and to share lessons learned by CEPF grantees. Flying team was successful in assisting Grant Manager in conflict resolution and achieving positive political interventions at the district, provincial and national levels.</p>
<p>2.2. Grant Manager assists lead NGOs in each of the four focal areas in completing consensus-based five-year conservation vision maps for each area by January 2003.</p>	<p>CII took the lead in developing conservation outcomes definition and monitoring for Sumatra to show change of forest in Sumatra since the beginning of CEPF (or even earlier) until end of CEPF-supported interventions in Sumatra. This exercise enabled a refinement of conservation vision/action maps for each of CEPF's focal areas in Sumatra.</p>
<p>2.3. Grant Manager facilitates communication and cooperation between NGOs working within each of the four focal areas and, when relevant, communication and cooperation among all CEPF grantees on Sumatra.</p>	<p>CEPF helped catalyze different formats of conservation consortiums that now exist in each of the focal areas. Composition of the alliances depended on political and social context and also capacity of the area's NGOs.</p> <p>In the Northern Sumatra Corridor, a strong collaboration between CI Indonesia and BITRA developed in Batang Gadis National Park. In Tesso Nilo Bukit 30, Jikahalari, a consortium of more than 20 NGOs, was</p>

	facilitated by WWF. In Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park, WCS developed a more formal consortium for training local conservation leaders under the CEPF-supported CANOPI program.
2.4. Grant Manager liaises on at least a monthly basis with the head of CI-Indonesia to inform him of CEPF-funded projects and opportunities for CI-I to assist or work with CEPF grantees working on Sumatra.	Grant Manager met with head of CI Indonesia as often as possible, usually twice a month.
Output 3: CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager reports to CEPF in Washington, DC, in line with specifications agreed with Asia Grant Director	
3.1. Grant Manager communicates by telephone on a weekly with the Asia Grant Director.	Grant Manager communicated with Asia Grant Director on daily basis by e-mails and/or telephone.
3.2 Grant Manager submits written report on her activities monthly to Asia Grant Director.	Grant Manager submitted written trip reports after every field trip, and quarterly reports to CEPF.
3.3. Grant Manager writes articles about Sumatra grantees and their projects for CEPF's electronic newsletter and other relevant CEPF publications.	Grant Manager wrote or provided information for more than 10 articles about CEPF's Sumatra grantees for CEPF's electronic newsletter and other relevant CEPF publications.

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

The project successfully delivered its intended outputs. With CEPF support, a wide array of civil society was working in collaboration on conservation actions related to CEPF's Sundaland Ecosystem Profile. Working conservation alliances were built in different formats in Sumatra. Funding was leveraged for several successful and/or promising projects to either expand or carry on their conservation outcomes.

Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

There were no outputs unrealized.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

No such actions were required.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

The processes of developing the Ecosystem Profile and, later, vision maps for grantee action were important for consensus building that allowed alliances to be built and clusters of CEPF-supported projects to work collaboratively as a mean of scaling up conservation results. However, expectations should have been managed in the beginning, so that civil society on the ground would not expect that big money would be made available instantly.

Having lead organizations on the ground works well, and it helped CEPF achieve the intent of the Ecosystem Profiles strategic directions. However, the process of choosing lead organizations on the ground should be transparent with clear criteria. In the beginning, the choice of lead organizations brought questions and concerns from local NGOs who felt that lead organizations may have been chosen because of their “closeness” to CEPF in DC. (In reality, the lead organizations had clear comparative advantage in planning corridor conservation and mentoring smaller NGOs.)

It was important that CEPF’s “eyes and ears” on the ground (ie. local conservation units) have clear terms of reference, clear reporting lines vis a vis CEPF in DC, and the authority to represent CEPF with grantee and lead organizations. Many issues and problems were resolved because of strong communications established between the Grant Manager and grantees.

It was important that the Grant Manager or coordination unit be familiar with and communicated with CEPF applicants for the full time frame needed for processing grants. While CEPF was more agile than other funding institutions, its process was nonetheless a thorough one.

It also was important to plan disbursement of CEPF’s Sumatra investment over its five years so that projects successfully delivering conservation outcomes might have hope of continued support from CEPF. For better grant management, I recommend a non-rolling application process; a series of calls for proposals would allow for a better comparative analysis among proposals. This also would help CEPF manage a more defined and reliable time frame in processing grants. However, this method may prevent coordination units from giving large amounts of personal attention to applicants who need it, as hundreds of applications would come in simultaneously.

As CEPF matures, monitoring and evaluation tools should be prepared ahead of time to enable coordination units to better monitor conservation impacts on the ground.

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

The practice of funding small NGOs as a means of building their capacity for project planning and implementation was a good one. Certainly some will be able to gradually apply for bigger grants to fund longer, more complex projects with greater conservation outcomes.

Locally based coordination units were crucial in assisting CEPF grantees in planning and implementing the projects as well as raising their capacities for proper procurement, project administration, reporting, and strategic thinking.

Coordination units should meet with grantees who are heading corridor-level conservation efforts and consortiums on a regular basis to track conservation outcomes and ensure that alliances hold. At the Sumatra-wide level, an all CEPF-grantees meeting will be helpful for understanding and documenting conservation outcomes and lessons learned at a regional level as well as attracting donors to follow in CEPF’s footsteps.

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

No additional funding was raised to support this project specifically. This project was limited to support the function of the local coordination unit.

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

This project will continue under a follow-on CEPF grant at least until the end of 2006, when CEPF's first five years in Sumatra comes to a close.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
--

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes

No

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Purbasari Surjadi

Mailing address: Pejaten Barat 16 A, Kemang, Jakarta 12550, Indonesia

Tel: 62-21-78838624; 78838626 ext. 105

Fax: 62-21-7806723

E-mail: p.surjadi@conservation.org