CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International - Indonesia

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Defining, Refining, and Monitoring Outcomes for Sumatra

Implementation Partners for this Project: Indonesian Scientific Agency (LIPI), the Ministry of Forestry, the Syiah Kuala University and the Andalas University and the Wildlife Conservation Society.

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): October 1, 2004 – December 31, 2006

Date of Report (month/year): February 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

Conservation International (CI) and the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) use "conservation outcomes" as the scientific underpinning for focusing conservation investment geographically and thematically. These conservation outcomes comprise the effective conservation of a set of species, sites, and broader-scale corridors that are essential for preventing biodiversity loss. Identifying these outcomes for Sumatra ensures that conservation action focuses on the species at the greatest risk of extinction, and on the sites and landscapes that are most important for their protection. These also provide a baseline upon which a systematic approach to monitoring can be set in place that will permit the objective comparative assessment of conservation results against which the success of investments can be measured, and that will build donor trust and improve on-the-ground conservation action.

Conservation outcomes at the species level are those that are globally threatened with extinction, meeting the criteria of Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable according to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Outcomes at the site level are sites of global biodiversity conservation significance, “key biodiversity areas” (KBAs) that are actually or potentially manageable for conservation. Targets at the landscape level are termed “biodiversity conservation corridors” and aim to ensure the persistence of threatened species and KBAs.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose**:* Government, NGOs and donors target conservation investment, implementation, and monitoring towards globally threatened species, key biodiversity areas (which includes the establishment of new reserves and enhanced protection of existing reserves, to ensure representation and persistence of all documented species and that effective protection is in place in all key sites), and biodiversity conservation corridors within Sumatra.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
Key conservation organizations working in Sumatra agree to work in partnership on established conservation outcomes by end of 2005.	The conservation outcomes project was competed in collaboration with a number of partners, including those listed above. Implementation of conservation projects and outcomes monitoring will also proceed in collaboration with partners.
Biodiversity conservation organizations are focusing activities on established conservation outcomes [Year 2].	Many of the partners, including CI, are currently working on identified conservation outcomes. Some examples include: FFI working at Ulu Masen Ecosystem and Kerinci Seblat NP; LIF in Leuser Ecosystem; CI & Bitra in Batang Gadis National Park; Wetlands International in Berbak Sembilang; WARSI in Bukit Tigapuluh NP; WWF in Tesso Nilo; and WCS in Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park; among others.
Donors are making funding available to new projects focused on target species, sites and corridors [Year 3].	Throughout the CEPF funding cycle, CI and partners were able to leverage US$6.8 million toward the conservation objectives of the ecosystem profile, focusing project implementation on target species, sites and corridors. Funds that have been leveraged to support current CEPF investment include: BRR-MDF in Leuser and Ulu Masen, and USAID in Batang Toru. The USFWS has invested in the conservation of tiger, orangutan, and other threatened species. Targeted fundraising and communications efforts are planned to encourage further investment.

CI and partner organizations agree on a process for defining and monitoring the status of biodiversity [Year 1]; region-specific monitoring needs are identified [Year 2]; consensus is reached for jointly administering an information system [Year 3]; and data from monitoring and outcomes database are used to inform regional conservation planning [Year 3]) by Year 3.	CI and partner organizations have agreed on a process for defining and monitoring the status of biodiversity, in part through the January 2006 Outcomes Monitoring Workshops; region-specific monitoring needs were also identified through these workshops, and documented in the workshop report. Data from the online World Biodiversity Database (WBDB), publications, and other sources will be used to inform regional conservation planning.
National, District (Province), and County-level governing bodies have developed park management and monitoring plans that target needs of species outcomes identified by this project [Year 5].	Communication regarding the outcomes process and results has been directed towards government agencies and donors through the outcomes monitoring workshops, the January 2007 spatial planning workshop, and through more informal meetings with relevant institutions. Further information will be provided through the WBDB and publications. Thus, the foundation is in place for national, province, and county-level governing bodies to developed park management and monitoring plans that target the needs of species outcomes identified by this project.

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

All project outputs were completed successfully:

- Conservation outcomes were identified for Sumatra at the species, site and landscape levels, building on earlier priority setting efforts and utilizing data from over 100 experts and institutions. Thus, the KBAs and candidate KBAs identified through this project are based on very strong, well documented data on species occurrence. The project also included pioneering work in the identification of spatial requirements for area demanding threatened species.
- The outcomes definition and monitoring process was introduced to partners very early in the project cycle, with continued partner engagement throughout the project. This resulted in an excellent level of buy-in.
- Outcomes monitoring data were compiled on the four core indicators.
- The change detection analysis was completed successfully for 1990 to 2000, and a highly accurate map was produced.
- Several key partners are already investing in the conservation of the biodiversity conservation targets identified through this project, and the results of this project have already enabled partners to leverage funding for conservation efforts (see above).
- A publication on the results of the outcomes project will be completed in the coming months and distributed to partners and donors.

Details regarding project outputs are below.

As described above, an increasing number of projects are being focused on the biodiversity conservation targets identified through this project. For instance, new strategies adopted by the University of Andalas and LIPI include focusing their research efforts on threatened species and KBAs. Furthermore the establishment of baseline on the four core indicators provides an informative portfolio of data that can be utilized to guide future investment and policy decision making for Sumatra. These data will also serve to raise awareness amongst all stakeholders of changes in the status of biodiversity in areas of the highest global significance. The dissemination and use of these outcomes data can also form the basis of future strategic planning and collaborative fundraising initiatives.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?
No

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: Outcomes refinement and monitoring program is defined in collaboration with partners.	Partners were introduced to outcomes definition and monitoring during the two biodiversity monitoring workshops in Padang and Banda Aceh in January of 2006 (as well as at a November 2005 meeting in Jakarta, and through many more informal meetings). Through these meetings, we obtained input from partners regarding the process and results. Partnership building efforts (workshops and meetings) have identified data providers and users for Sumatra who will continue to contribute to the refinement of conservation outcomes and the long-term monitoring of species, sites and corridors.
1.1. Project staff in place and trained by month 1. Training in the outcomes refinement and monitoring process, and use of outcomes database, undertaken for project staff by month 3.	The terms of reference of the Outcomes Definition and Outcomes Monitoring Coordinators were approved in the preliminary stages of project implementation. The two coordinators were subsequently hired and trained.
1.2. Workplans for the Outcome Refinement and Monitoring team and key partners (e.g. Forest Watch Indonesia, WCS) developed by month 3.	Completed
Output 2: Full set of species-level targets for achieving conservation outcomes refined and documented for Sumatra, with specific	The full set of species-level targets for achieving conservation outcomes identified and documented for Sumatra.

conservation interventions identified for each species outcome.	(Please refer to the *Species Outcomes report* and the *Outcomes Database*)
2.1. Harmonize 2003 CAMP workshop results with species outcomes definition process by month 6: feed endemic snake and fish assessments into a peer review process to enable incorporation into IUCN Red List and the outcomes database; share mammal assessments made at the workshop with the Global Mammal Assessment; and incorporate information on research and management needs identified at the workshop for each species outcome into outcomes database.	CAMP results made available to IUCN Biodiversity Assessment Unit (BAU). The snake data should be incorporated into the data compilation process for the Global Reptile Assessment (a workshop is proposed for Indonesia). Data provided to the Global Mammal Assessment.
2.2. List of globally threatened species in Sumatra finalized. Information on distribution, threats, conservation actions, key references, and contacts entered for these species into the outcomes database; . List of restricted-range species for Sumatra finalized by month 4.	248 globally threatened species are known to occur in Sumatra. List of restricted range bird and amphibian species finalized. Additional data on restricted range and Congregatory species will be added as they become available. (Please refer to the *Species Outcomes report* and the *Outcomes Database*)
2.3. Expert review of species-level conservation outcomes defined for the hotspot by month 6.	Species outcomes reviewed by experts during the two outcomes monitoring workshops in January 2006, and also through informal meetings.
2.4. Species that cannot be conserved at the site-scale alone (i.e. corridor target species), as well as species in need of non-habitat-based actions, identified and documented by month 6	Thirty area demanding threatened species were identified as occurring in Sumatra. Some data were gathered on species in need of non-habitat-based actions, and data will continue to be compiled as they become available.
Output 3: Full set of site and corridor-level targets for conservation outcomes defined, documented and mapped for Sumatra, with specific conservation interventions identified for each site and corridor.	62 Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) have been identified and delineated based on the presence of species for which site-scale conservation is deemed necessary to avoid extinctions in the short- and medium- term: globally threatened species, restricted-range species and globally significant congregations of species. (Please refer to the *large-format KBA map* and the *Outcomes Database*)

3.1. Spatial data on protected areas, IBAs, geographic and topographic features, and species distributions (e.g. CAMP database and other datasets) compiled into a GIS database to facilitate definition of site outcomes or Key Biodiversity Areas by month 3.	Spatial data on protected areas, IBAs, AZE sites, geographic and topographic features, and species distributions were compiled into a GIS database. The draft forest change map was also used to inform KBA delineation.
3.2. Data on Important Bird Areas obtained from BirdLife International or its Indonesian partner and entered into Outcomes Database; populations of globally threatened species, restricted range species, and globally significant congregations in other taxonomic groups recorded for these sites and documented in the outcomes database by month 6.	Data on IBAs obtained and entered into the outcomes database.
3.3. Additional sites holding populations of globally threatened species, restricted range species and globally significant congregations identified by month 12. Information synthesized for each site (i.e. Key Biodiversity Area) and entered into outcomes database. Key biodiversity areas delineated by month 12.	Additional KBAs beyond IBAs and AZE sites identified for target species. Information for each KBA entered into the outcomes database, including species-site relationships.
3.4. Corridor-level targets defined and refined based on: 1) area and connectivity requirements for wide-ranging, migratory, or low density threatened species, 2) large-scale ecological processes, and smaller-scale habitat corridors by month 12.	Thirty area demanding species identified. Area requirements mapped for several of these species.
3.5. Expert review of site- and corridor-level conservation targets defined for the hotspot by month 12.	Expert review of KBAs through the two outcomes monitoring workshops in January 2006, in Sumatra. Additional KBA review by experts through informal meetings. Review of area-demanding species data by CABS staff and others.
3.6. Updated map of site- and corridor-level outcomes produced and made available to CEPF and partners to use to monitor achievements across Sumatra by month 14.	Map of KBAs and Candidate KBAs produced in Jakarta by CI-Indonesia, and distributed to partners during the January 2007 spatial analysis workshop in Banda Aceh. This map is in Bahasa. An additional map in English will be provided to CEPF as a deliverable of this project. (Please refer to the *large-format KBA map*)
3.7. Spatial and textual data on outcomes made available to the public through the outcomes	Though included as a deliverable of this project, Access-based outcomes database will not be made available to stakeholders because

database. Stakeholders trained to access outcomes database so that they can review and contribute to the refinement and monitoring of conservation outcomes over time by month 16.	of the imminent transition to the online version of the database (the World Biodiversity Database). Data will be distributed through the online version, through maps, and other publications as they are developed (by June 2007).
Output 4: Conservation outcomes analyzed and prioritized to guide decision-making (grant making, choice of site-based project implementation, research projects) for CI programs, donors, and broader conservation community.	The 7 AZE sites represent the highest priority targets for conservation investment at the site level. The full set of KBAs were prioritized; however, this is only a preliminary analysis, since data on threats and opportunities were limited. The prioritization work will be refined over the next year. (Please refer to the *large-format KBA map*)
4.1. Gap analysis conducted on representation of species and site outcomes within protected area network; Prioritization among KBAs for the creation of new protected areas, improved management of existing protected areas, and targeting of research grants to fill information gaps by month 13.	Gap analysis completed, based on available data.
4.2. Preliminary management recommendations articulated for select KBAs in Northern Sumatra and distributed to management authorities and donors by month 16	Preliminary recommendations available based on species and site data regarding KBAs in North Sumatra. However, the overarching need in North Sumatra is for biodiversity surveys to allow the identification of additional KBAs and candidate KBAs.
Output 5: Outcomes monitoring process is developed and baseline data delivered on primary indicators (Red List trends, Habitat Fragmentation, Area Protected Status, Change Detection) and other state, pressure and response indicators identified as priorities for the region.	Baseline has been reached for the 4 core outcomes monitoring indicators. Data collection for additional pressure (scope and severity of threat within KBAs) and response (change in management, governance and financing of protected KBAs) indicators currently underway.
5.1. Partners assessed for capacity to carry out elements of Outcomes Monitoring framework (by month 5)	Database housing partner contact information and data on the available capacity and resources to support long-term monitoring efforts completed. This information will serve to inform what and where technical expertise can be allocated to conduct future data collection and analysis activities for Sumatra. (please refer to '*Sumatra partner database*')
5.2. Initial background data, training needs and gaps in monitoring capacity are identified (by	Training and monitoring needs, as well as identification of gaps in monitoring capacity of partners completed during the Monitoring

month 7)	Workshop in Padang and Banda Aceh in January 2006. (Please refer to '*Proceedings: Determining Key Biodiversity Areas in Sumatra Workshop and Discussion on Data Sharing, Networking, Monitoring and Identifying Conservation Needs*).
5.3. Projects focused on Endangered (EN) and Critically Endangered (CR) species are documented and assessed for their ability to monitor framework indicators (by month 8).	CI is working on and supporting the efforts of partners in conducting species-based projects in Sumatra. Projects include Orangutan population monitoring in Batang Toru, Northern Sumatra. This project also includes capacity building initiatives to support the establishment of sustainable and systematic patrolling and enforcement activities. Similarly, a CI supported Tiger population monitoring project has been initiated in Batang Gadis. The project has implemented camera trapping techniques that also capture population and point locality data for other KBA target species. Key CI partners supported through the CEPF funding cycle are also building capacity to conduct long-term research and monitoring efforts that focus on globally threatened species. Data generated through these projects will inform future Red List assessments for all major taxonomic groups in Sumatra, thus strengthening the robustness of species threatened status criteria as well as any changes that occur resulting in new information.
5.4. Monitoring/information gap analysis completed by Month 10.	The gap analysis centers around future fundraising efforts, notably the establishment of a biodiversity conservation trust fund initiative to support further priority setting and monitoring data collection and analysis efforts While details of the information gap analysis are included in the Biodiversity Monitoring Workshop report, the following are critical future needs that have been identified for Sumatra: 1) Wide dissemination of project findings to stakeholders and key decision makers. 2) Formal establishing of biodiversity monitoring network/alliance that articulate

	clear roles and responsibilities of key partners. 3) Collection of protected area data to evaluate changes in management, governance and financing of protected Key Biodiversity Areas. 4) Fundraising to support conducting 2000-2005 forest cover change analysis.
5.5. Partners engage in a process for selecting priority indicators, developing monitoring methods, identifying information needs and products, drafting workplans and preparing a long-term fundraising strategy by month 12 (this may take place through a workshop, bilateral meetings, or other type of partner engagement activities).	Two Monitoring Workshops were conducted in Padang and Banda Aceh in January 2007. Padang was chosen due to the available scientific capacity in Andalas University, the largest University in Central and South Sumatra. The close proximity of the Syiah Kuala University in Banda Aceh also provided the necessary expertise to support the proceedings. Both workshops brought together local and regional stakeholders to form a collaborative biodiversity planning and monitoring network that will oversee future data collection, analysis and reporting responsibilities, as well as fundraising to ensure long-term sustainability. For further information please refer to: '*Proceedings: Determining Key Biodiversity Areas in Sumatra Workshop and Discussion on Data Sharing, Networking, Monitoring and Identifying Conservation Needs*).
5.6. Baseline data for at least four core status indicators as well as prioritized pressure and response indicators delivered for the region by month 18	Baseline data has been generated for the four core indicators, Red List Index, change in habitat cover within KBAs, change in protected status of KBAs & change in fragmentation within Biodiversity Conservation Corridors.
Output 6: Forest cover change analysis and production of a change detection map (1990-2000) for Sumatra completed in collaboration with partners as part of the global Outcomes Monitoring protocol.	
6.1. Both DC and in-country processing team (CI-co-investigator, FWI staff, and other identified team members) assembled, initial image database created, and aerial survey data options researched by month 4.	The Regional Analysis Division of CABS and CI-Indonesia worked together to identify an appropriate in-country partner to conduct the change detection analysis. FWI was unable to perform the work and therefore Wildlife Conservation Society-Indonesia was chosen. WCS also invited the Ministry of Forestry to participate in the training and image

	processing and one staff member from MoF joined in the project.
	Regional Analysis acquired all of the necessary satellite imagery and sent it to WCS, where it was processed and cataloged. Aerial photos were not publicly available for purchase and aerial surveys were not possible in Sumatra due to government restrictions. Therefore, high resolution satellite imagery was chosen to validate the mapping results.
6.2. Training workshop held by month 6.	The initial two-week training workshop was held at the WCS office in Bogor, Indonesia in June of 2005. Regional Analysis staff led the training which was attended by WCS and MoF staff members.
6.3. Collection and processing of aerial survey data through workshop by month 6	Aerial survey data were not used as described in item 6.1.
6.4. Second workshop to review and finish change detections by month 8	The second follow-up workshop was held at the WCS office in Bogor in Dec., 2005. During this workshop, major refinements were made to the methodology to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the change detection analysis.
6.5. Finalization and regional mosaic by month 10.	The final classified map included 34 Landsat scenes that were merged together into a single mosaic. Each scene was individually classified by WCS or CI and then quality checked by Regional Analysis staff. The final mosaic was assembled in Dec. 2006 and then quality checked several times. Revisions were made in several iterations in a group effort until an extremely high-quality product was achieved.
6.6. Validation using aerial surveys and available supplementary ground data performed by team by month 15.	Validation of the final map was made using Ikonos high resolution satellite imagery instead of aerial photography, which was not available. Five Ikonos images were purchased by WCS and used to sample different regions of the map. The overall map accuracy was above 90%. (Please refer to the *Forest Change map for Sumatra*)
6.7. Fragmentation and overlay analyses models run on data by month 15.	Fragmentation analyses, including changes in patch size and distance to habitat edge completed.

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

The intended project outputs have been completed during the allocated project timeframe.

Conservation outcomes were successfully identified and documented. A total of 248 globally threatened species are known to occur in Sumatra (based on data from the 2004 IUCN Red List). A total of 62 KBAs were identified for threatened and endemic amphibians, mammals, birds, reptiles, and freshwater fish, using confirmed locality data for each target species. An additional 18 candidate KBAs have also been identified as research priorities. Thirty of the globally threatened species found in Sumatra were identified as requiring action at the landscape scale, either because they were area-demanding, or because they were vulnerable to changes in hydrological processes. Area requirements for several of these species were mapped to inform decision makers in better managing areas currently not under legal protection; this pioneering work is now being used as a model for a project in the Philippines (a collaboration between CI and ICRAF). As more data become available, outcomes at all three scales will be refined.

Outcomes monitoring has been introduced to partners through the January 2006 Outcomes Monitoring workshops and through other follow-up meetings. Data have been collected on the four core outcomes monitoring indicators. As a result of progress made during the project, the outcomes monitoring alliance should be formalized in the coming months.

The 1990-2000 forest change detection was carried out successfully, with the production of a highly accurate map product (greater than 90% accuracy). An update for 2000 through 2005/6 is planned.

All products will now serve to inform where, how and why future strategies will be implemented in Sumatra. To further support these products, we intend to develop a comprehensive dissemination strategy to communicate our findings to all relevant stakeholders. As part of this strategy, communication materials will be developed during the next few months (these will likely include a publication on the results of the outcomes project and a foldout map of the KBAs and change detection work).

Post-project, we also intend to work through our project partners to collect additional data-sets that complement the results of the four core indicators. This will notably include collection and analysis of management, governance and financing information within the network of protected Key Biodiversity Areas within Sumatra. This additional layer of information will strengthen the use of the outcomes data in informing which sites of global conservation significance should be prioritized, and in selecting appropriate conservation actions within these sites.

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

No.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

Not applicable, since this was a desk study.

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.

As with outcomes projects in other regions, the engagement of partners has been essential to the success of this project. In particular, the involvement of government departments and universities has been critical to gaining strong buy-in within the region.

The workshops held in Sumatra were extremely successful at providing outcomes data to partners and in addressing concerns from stakeholders. The timing of the Sumatra outcomes monitoring workshops was ideal in terms of enabling stakeholder review of the KBA and other outcomes data. Preliminary KBAs had been identified, and species outcomes had been finalized; as a result, we were able to incorporate comments and additional data from partners. An important recommendation for other regions engaging in KBA identification work is to hold a similar stakeholder workshop after preliminary KBA identification work has been completed and preliminary maps and other products have been produced.

Follow-up to the two Biodiversity Monitoring workshops did not move forward as quickly as originally envisaged and this ultimately limited the speed at which partnership building activities have moved forward, in particular formally establishing an alliance made up of well resourced and capacitated partners. Currently however, there is a concerted effort to socialize the findings of the two workshops to all partners through distribution of the workshop report. We continue to emphasize the need to establish a formal steering committee of decision makers that represents key organizations across Sumatra. The major objective of this network of partners will be to oversee strategy developing, fundraising efforts and all decision making associated with these activities. The alliance will act as a hub to provide recommendations to the active conservation community regarding a collaborative course of action for future biodiversity priority setting and monitoring for Sumatra. The following recommendations and needs (determined by participants at the workshops) should be central to a future regional strategy plan:

- Agree on tools and protocols regarding data sharing and push forward with formally signing a data sharing agreement with the key institutions that will regularly provide and use the information. A follow up meeting with key representatives needs to be carried out to formally establish this agreement.
- Appoint a task force/steering committee with well-defined roles for participants and institutional roles.
    a. Key activities should include developing next steps with a strict timeline to direct achievement of deliverables, drawing up of guidelines for data collection, analysis and reporting and collaborative fundraising proposals that target capacity building for monitoring.
    b. Use the task force as a mechanism to establish a process to maintain communication between data users and providers within the network.

c. Use task force resources to fundraise for staffing to support maintenance of biodiversity monitoring network.

- Identify resources and dates for follow up workshop to discuss progress made and to develop a strategy to leverage collected baseline data into decision making processes at the government and donor levels.

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

As with the China and Philippines outcomes projects, the proposed time frame was too short. This type of project, if planned in other regions, should be allowed a two to two and a half year time frame. A KBA review workshop should be held about 1.5 years into the project, to allow for validation and input from stakeholders. Given the longer time frame, more funding was needed for this project than initially anticipated.

In future projects, funding should also be built in for publications to help disseminate the results (such as KBA booklets or directories). To ensure continued stakeholder buy-in and use of outcomes data in strategic planning and conservation investment, we hope to develop a portfolio of publications and maps that target key partners and decision makers in Sumatra. While we intend to create dissemination products over the coming months, additional fundraising is now required to develop publications and maps that consolidate and explore the decision making utility of the project results. Additional funding is also needed to include the most recent data and analysis in the forest cover and clearance maps. The Landsat satellite imagery for 1990-2000 is freely available, but to conduct the analyses for 2005/6, the data must be purchased.

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

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.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Conservation Synthesis, CABS (CI)	Project co-financing	$14,000	Salary, Travel
Regional Analysis, CABS (CI)	Project co-financing	$10,000	Salary
Outcomes Monitoring, PPC (CI)	Project co-financing	$26,000	Salary, Travel
CI - Indonesia, CSD	Project co-financing	$24,000	Salary, travel
GIS Lab, CABS (CI)	Project co-financing	$4,500	Salary for production of forest cover and KBA maps

****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 funded 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 funded 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.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

None

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 ___X____
No _____

If yes, please also complete the following:

For more information about this project, please contact:
Name: Iwan Wijayanto
Mailing address: Jl. Pejaten Barat 16 A, Kemang, Jakarta, 12550
Tel: + 62 21 7883 8624
Fax: +6221 7806 723
E-mail: iwijayanto@conservation.org