

## FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

### I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Name:** Wildlife Conservation Society

**Project Title:** CANOPI: A Road Map for Future Management at Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park, Indonesia

**Project Dates:** July 1, 2002 – Dec. 31, 2002

**Date of Report:** May 2003

### II. OPENING REMARKS

### III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** The immediate purpose of this project was to build a foundation for all future CANOPI activities by reaching a consensus between key partners and producing a formal plan for Bukit Barisan Selatan management. The primary product from these efforts is a written document, a 'Masterplan for CANOPI', which is the "roadmap" for all projects and activities associated with CANOPI and BBS conservation.

#### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
1.1 Key stakeholders endorse the CANOPI program for training conservation leaders for BBS conservation.	Key stakeholders endorse the CANOPI program for training conservation leaders for BBS conservation.
1.2 Stakeholders endorse shared mission and vision for CANOPI and its implementation.	Stakeholders endorse shared mission and vision for CANOPI and its implementation.
1.3 Key stakeholders accept and carry forward relevant roles and responsibilities to ensure success of CANOPI.	Key stakeholders accept and carry forward relevant roles and responsibilities to ensure success of CANOPI.
1.4 Key stakeholders endorse and implement CANOPI work plan for 2002-2007.	Key stakeholders endorse and implement CANOPI work plan for 2002-2007.
1.5 Holders of all data on BBSNP share data for input into database on wildlife, habitats, threats, etc., for use as a tool in managing and conserving BBSNP.	Although some of the basic data by various partners were shared, there were many problems including: a) some had collected no data; 2) collected data were in an incomprehensible format; 3) some partners not willing to share data.
1.6 Database on wildlife, habitats, threats, etc., is used by key stakeholders as a tool in managing and conserving	The database on wildlife, habitat, threats, etc., is used to develop CANOPI vision map and master plan as the framework in

BBSNP.	managing and conserving BBS.
--------	------------------------------

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

CANOPI program is the first integrated and comprehensive partnership framework developed for the BBS landscape and national park. It has pulled together groups and agencies from different sectors and has allowed these groups to channel their efforts toward the common goal of conserving the ecosystems of the BBS landscape. Today, CANOPI is supported by 12 NGOs as well as the national park office and Department of Forestry (PHKA) and local government agencies (Pemerintah Daerah) at the provincial and kabupaten levels. Having pulled a large number of groups to focus on a common goal, all the groups worked together to develop a number of strategies to carry out a common goal.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

Positive impact:

Although we were expecting negative responses by the local governments, there were tremendous positive responses toward this initiative. There was statement of support by governments at the kabupaten level to be part of the regional steering committee to help organize the coordination of CANOPI activities and regional land use and natural resource management.

Negative impact:

Many of the partners – actual or potential – have not had many experiences dealing with donors and international agencies. Many had misperceptions about the role of the donor, international NGOs, and about the entire proposal-making process. We did not expect that the majority of the discussions would be centered on the issue of funding.

<b>IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS</b>
----------------------------

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

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Actual at Completion</b>
<b>Output 1:</b> Organize and lead science-based evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) of the current BBSNP management and evaluation of opportunities for improvement.	Science-based evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) of the current BBSNP management has been conducted as described in CANOPI master plan and vision map.
1.1. Bring together stakeholders to participate in a joint exercise of sharing information and data, including biological as well as socio-economic factors, and discussing relevance and accuracy of the information.	Bring together stakeholders to participate in a joint exercise of sharing information and data, including biological as well as socio-economic factors, and discussing relevance and accuracy of the information.
1.2. Compilation and analysis of existing information and data.	Compilation and analysis of existing information and data.
1.3. Facilitate discussion on format in	Will be carried out in the next term of

which data will be synthesized.	CANOPI program.
1.4 English and Indonesian reports on results of consultative process available to all participants.	English and Indonesian reports on the results of consultative process have been distributed to all participants.
<b>Output 2:</b> Creation of shared mission and vision for CANOPI program.	Creation of shared mission and vision for CANOPI program.
2.1 Convene all key partners working at BBSNP to discuss shared mission and vision for CANOPI.	Convene all key partners working at BBSNP to discuss shared mission and vision for CANOPI.
2.2 Facilitate key stakeholders' creation of a five-year vision map, which will highlight desired conservation outcomes of CANOPI and conservation of BBSNP.	Facilitate key stakeholders' creation of a five-year vision map, which highlights desired conservation outcomes of CANOPI and conservation of BBSNP.
2.3. Selection of key partners in implementation of CANOPI framework.	Six key partners have been selected for the implementation of CANOPI framework, including Watala, Alas Indonesia, IRCP, Greenomics, IHSA, WWF Indonesia.
<b>Output 3:</b> Create Masterplan for CANOPI and BBSNP management 2002-2007.	Not completed. Still in draft form.
3.1 Creation of database by which Masterplan can be formulated, monitored, and, when necessary, revised.	Will be established in the next term of CANOPI program.
3.2. Input of shared data into database.	All collected data have been entered into database.
3.3. Build capacity of key partners to use database as tool to manage and conserve BBSNP.	Will be carried out in the next term of CANOPI program.
3.4. Facilitate formulation of Masterplan by key partners and stakeholders.	A series of informal meetings and workshops have been carried out to formulate Masterplan of CANOPI program 2002 – 2007.
<b>Output 4:</b> Creation and submission of at least three funding proposals in order to implement CANOPI and Masterplan for BBSNP, as agreed by the aforementioned process.	WCS and Greenomics have developed two proposals. Watala has developed the first draft of its proposal, which they have submitted to CEPF for review.
4.1. Organize and lead discussions with key partners on the CEPF proposal submission process.	Organize and lead discussions with key partners on the CEPF proposal submission process. WCS-IP Lampung office staff have been facilitating several informal meeting on CANOPI proposal submission process attended by local partners. Recently, an informal meeting on this issue was carried out in February 2003 in WCS-IP Lampung office. This meeting was attended by Mrs. Purbasari, CEPF grant manager for Sumatra.
4.2. Submission of at least one proposal by WCS for primary implementation of	WCS have sent a letter of inquiry to CEPF. A draft of complete proposal is

CANOPI.	also available.
4.3. Assist at two other applicants in creating proposals to CEPF for implementing five-year vision for BBSNP.	We have been assisting Watala and Greenomics in creating proposal to CEPF. WCS has also assisted Greenomics in writing a letter of inquiry for its proposal of which already sent to CEPF. Watala has developed the first draft of its proposal, which is still under review by CEPF.

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

CANOPI has conducted several informal meetings with key partners and workshops attended by various stakeholders to develop a Masterplan and a vision map for the program. It is the first integrated and comprehensive program ever been initiated for BBSNP. We conducted a public consultation workshop as the first step toward 'socializing' the CANOPI program. With this first workshop, virtually all groups gave strong support for this initiative. With this support, there was great momentum to carry forward this process – one in which we aimed to collect the necessary data and identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). The third and fourth workshop aimed to take this information and formulate strategies and work plans that would work within the common goal of conserving the ecosystems of the BBS landscape. We believe that the entire process, although difficult at times, has been a good model for facilitating a common effort between groups that have different backgrounds, skills, and experiences. We believe that the key elements to the success of this project were: 1) the involvement of local partners from the very beginning; and 2) having the leadership skills to make some unpleasant decisions in order for the successful completion of tasks.

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

Three output indicators related to data base development (Output Indicators 1.3, 3.1 and 3.3) are not realized. Generally, these have no significant effect on the overall success of the project. Even though the data base development has not been completed yet, we have already hold the major data related to BBS conservation management that already been used in developing the existing CANOPI master plan and vision map. The creation and development of an integrated database for CANOPI will need greater effort in design and maintenance, which is proposed in the next term of CANOPI program implementation. Finally, the Masterplan has not been completed because of the lateness in getting the vision map translated by WCS, read, and reviewed by local partners. Completion of a vision map, a document that would be the foundation for the Masterplan, was met with a number of delays. First, when we spoke to our partners about data that they had already collected, we assumed incorrectly that the data would be one or more of the following: 1. standardized in their own format; 2. entered into a computer; 3. summarized; 4. most of the data correct; 5. accessible. Furthermore, the specific details that were to be specified in the Masterplan could not be agreed upon because a number of matters that confused the overall process including: 1. who the main players would be to carry out activities; 2. when the CANOPI program would officially start; 3. how the Masterplan would be implemented; 4. lack of clarity on current activities and future plans by other partners.

## V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

## 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.***

There were many lessons learned, but perhaps because the political and social landscape to carry out this work is constantly changing, these lessons may or may not apply to future projects. A primary aim of CEPF is to conserve biological diversity through a partnership framework, and partnership in Indonesia, particularly in the context of foreign funding, can be a minefield. When local groups see a large sum of money (I don't think there has been this much funding for conservation in Sumatra), the language that the west use for partnership seems to immediately revolve around the issue of money. Adding to this is a virtual absence of experience of local groups dealing with donors, project implementation, professionalism, long-term goals, etc. All these factors make for a difficult situation in which groups – international, national, and local – are expected to be equals and work in harmony. We must realize that virtually every local NGO has financial problems (i.e., they have no source of funding/income). Therefore, when expectations of receiving funds are raised without clearly explaining the process, qualifications, etc., it becomes difficult to convince them that it is not a matter of asking and quickly receiving funds. A final note is a matter of semantics and scale. What the west considers small may be quite large in Indonesia. As “small grants” are defined as \$10,000 or less by CEPF, but may be considered huge sums by local groups, many local NGOs believed that getting a “small grant” should be a simple matter.

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

WCS has worked at BBSNP for a number of years and has worked with a number of local groups. One assumption, probably false on our part, was that our good working relationship would carry over into project activities. We did not predict that money would be the driving force in many of the discussions. The delays and problems revolved around the funding issue.

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

Many of the partners – actual or potential – have not had many experiences dealing with donors and international agencies. Many had misperceptions about the role of the donor, international NGOs, and about the entire proposal-making process. We did not expect that the majority of the discussions would be centered on the issue of funding.

## VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Fully explain the proposal and implementation process to potential grantees. The absence of a full explanation leads to serious misunderstandings that may lead to project failures.

2. It's best not to call amounts of \$10,000 and below a "small grant".
3. It's best not to say, "anyone can apply, anytime" during presentations. It leads to the expectation that any individual deserves to get funding, and there are no requirements for getting funding.
4. A detailed explanation of structuring a logframe was extremely helpful. However, if there were no such explanations, it would be difficult for most people to structure a proposal (even with the 'cheat sheet').