

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Conservation International – Indonesia

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** *Rapid Response Team for Conservation Investment in Sumatra*

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** Ministry of Forestry (MoF), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** October 1, 2004-June 30, 2007

**Date of Report (month/year):** October 1, 2007

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

This project was designed to provide full support to the CEPF Sumatra portfolio and to not only guide the investment strategically, but to also mitigate/resolve conflict if any arose during the project's implementation. This was done by establishing an advisory council/board which members are the heads of international NGOs and the Ministry of Forestry that are supported by the technical team which is comprised of different skills. The so called "flying team" role was to serve as a catalyst to engage the civil society, government and the private sector as needed.

The roles that the team played were:

- Strengthening partnerships, networking and coalition building around issues, and the development of vertical and horizontal linkages that involve civil society into decision making processes.
- Establishment of knowledge-based decision support to manage conservation investments through a mutual trust, which allows various groups of stakeholders to identify, prioritize, plan, manage, monitor, and evaluate program and policy options according to existing acts and regulations.
- Strengthening conservation institutions through structured activities covering monitoring and evaluation for effective conservation investment

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** *Professionals from different institutions (government bodies, NGOs, local communities, the private sector, academia) develop long-lasting partnerships to act in favour of conservation in Sumatra's priority areas, identified by CEPF, and supported by national, local, and international donors.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	

<p><i>CEPF and other collaborating entities are engaged and supported all conservation interventions that are of need to be taken in the Sumatra priority areas</i></p>	<p>CEPF with support from CI, WWF, WCS and MoF was able to coordinate and consolidate to play the role as catalyst to become the driving force for a participatory process, leading agencies, and also promoting good conservation governance. National (MoF) and local government, local communities, local NGOs, and private sector agreed to support conservation interventions in their regions.</p>
<p><i>Key multistakeholders in Sumatra priority areas are supporting CEPF conservation efforts</i></p>	<p>National and local governments &amp; civil societies, were supportive of CEPF investment to leverage their conservation effort. In CEPF geographic focus, there are vision maps on how the forest should look in 5, 10, and 15 years time were drawn collaboratively. Most grantees and key stakeholders in the region used these documents to obtain the big picture of conservation in Sumatra</p>

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

Some highlights of achievements that came from the project activities:

1. Initiate participatory process involving communities, provincial and national levels and government institutions concerned, possibly the private sectors to develop consensus on finding solutions for conservation issues, including conflict resolution, as needed and appropriate; Some good examples are the negotiation on the forestry concessions in Siberut island, stopping gold mining operations in Batang Gadis, negotiating with the forest industry in Tesso Nilo, resolving the communication issue between the Bukit Barisan National Park with CANOPY, etc.
2. Conduct assessments of existing capacity and assess gaps, problems and needs to formulate possible solutions (stakeholder mapping); the Team was capturing and documenting the lessons learned during CEPF implementation.
3. Provide assistance to CEPF, to monitor and evaluate project progress, to ensure synchronization with the Sumatra Vision Maps and Strategic Directions articulated in the Ecosystem Profile for Sumatra. The team was reviewing the incoming proposals and providing necessary recommendation and approval
4. Encourage leadership on the management of CEPF investments since the government site should be taking the lead of the collaborative management which is the lesson learned has suggested and also because this type of management is still in the infancy phase compared to centralistic conservation management. The Team was dealing with the MoF to have the collaborative management concept approved for Batang Gadis and Tesso Nilo National Parks.
5. Provide know-how to increase leveraging funds to strengthen the CEPF investments especially from the government budget and other donors. The team had approached the MoF to approve the annual budget for the newly declared national parks including Batang Gadis and Teso Nilo. In addition, the team organized a series of fundraising trainings for CEPF grantees in Jakarta, Medan, Kerinci and Bandar Lampung.

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

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

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

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
-----------	----------------------

<b>Output 1: Support to monitoring CEPF-supported project implementation in sync with Sumatra's scientifically-based conservation outcomes and the CEPF Ecosystem Profile</b>	
<i>Technical team established immediately and functioning in CI to help CEPF monitor project implementation</i>	A team consisting different expertise in conservation biology, resource economy, policy among others were formed to assist in the proposal review and development
<i>CEPF proposals fully reviewed by CI Technical Team</i>	At least 12 proposals were reviewed and the team provided recommendations and approvals throughout the duration of the CEPF project investment in Sumatra
<i>Input on lesson learned by CEPF-supported projects and grantees</i>	The team inquired from CEPF grantees to share the lessons learned during project implementations. A lessons learned document was produced and circulated among different grantees for comment.
<b>Output 2: Facilitation for multi-stakeholder dialogues to remove barriers at technical and political levels to conservation success in Sumatra.</b>	
<i>CEPF Advisory Council functioning to facilitate multi stakeholders dialogue, negotiations or political interventions, as needed to support success of CEPF-supported projects/grantees/alliances</i>	An advisory council consisting of the heads of the leading NGOs (CI, WWF, WCS) and Ministry of Forestry officials was formed with a director general decree. The council was immediately dispatched to support CEPF.
<i>Interventions made to resolve problems/conflicts at the technical level encountered by CEPF-supported projects/grantees/alliances</i>	The council was playing a facilitator role to the development of the Batang Gadis and Teso Nilo National Parks management plan (RPTN), which resulting in the annual budget allocation for running the parks. CEPF Advisory Council facilitated conflict resolution among power holders who have interests in managing Batang Gadis National Park in North Sumatra, and also mediated some meetings toward conflict resolution amongst stakeholders in South Sumatra. The CEPF Advisory Council made an intervention over the use of government funding to finance conservation area management supported by CEPF in North Sumatra, and mediated meetings to resolve conflicts in South Sumatra. The technical team made intervention to resolve conflict in West Sumatra/Siberut Island.
<b>Output 3: Facilitation of central conservation vision for Sumatra as common agenda for relevant stakeholders (government, NGOs, private sectors, universities and other civil society).</b>	
<i>Long term conservation vision for Sumatra introduced to relevant stakeholders</i>	The technical team and CEPF Advisory Council participated and provided inputs in public discussion facilitated by North Sumatra government for the Provincial Spatial Plan taking into account CEPF investments in the region.
<i>Collaborative implementation concept agreed upon by key decision makers</i>	Refine lessons learned derived from Output 1 to draft "Collaborative Management" concept. Finalization of "collaborative management" concept to be agreed upon by key decision makers
<i>Coordination between government, NGOs, private sectors, NGOs and other civil society on conservation interventions in each CEPF priority area maintained and, if</i>	Meetings with government, NGOs, private sectors, NGOs, and other civil society to develop format for "coordination mechanism:" between all stakeholders in

<i>necessary, improved</i>	Sumatra. Attend/ participate/ organize meetings between stakeholders in Sumatra
<b>Output 4: Assist with solicitations to donor community for funding to secure long term conservation investment for Sumatra (i.e. Sumatra Trust Fund, BAPPENAS), including building capacity for fundraising and donor relations among CEPF grantees and their partners.</b>	
<i>Conservation investments by national and district level government facilitated to secure long term conservation investment for Sumatra</i>	CEPF Advisory Council have made an intervention to secure the government budget for National Parks and BKSDAs to maintain CEPF investments in north Sumatra & Siberut at least until 2006. The MoF allocated \$200,000 annually to run the Batang Gadis and Tesso Nilo parks
<i>Capacity building program facilitated for fundraising effort (proposal development, donor relationship maintenance) for key stakeholders</i>	Workshops for fundraising efforts for key stakeholders including the government officials and NGO staff were conducted in Jakarta, Medan, Sungai penuh and Bandar Lampung. A mailing list group was also formed to inform if any funding opportunity had arised

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

As part of the regional implementation team (RIT) for Sumatra portfolio, the technical team and advisory council project had successfully supported the progress of the CEPF implementation. Including the formation of the "Flying Team" members consisting of several qualified government and non-government experts on participatory processes and conflict resolution; Establishment of a monitoring mechanism to review the effectiveness of CEPF investment in Sumatra; lesson learned of the implementation of CEPF investment in Sumatra.

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

Most of the outputs were delivered as planned

**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.***

Some important lessons learned include building capacity at the alliance level (at consortium of NGOs level) which, more often than not, is not very clear, although at least 6

alliances/partnerships had been formed, it is necessary that they could survive beyond CEPF. Training on fundraising is not enough, there is also the need to be introduced or given access to potential donors.

The role and function of Advisory Council and the technical team was not well perceived by all grantees. Apparently only the leading institutions that were taking advantage of them, needed better socialization.

Species focus should expand to more than just charismatic species, there are more than 260 threatened species in existence and which need immediate attention.

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

The project design was a bottom-up process which was done through a consultation process with selected grantees and identifying needs and potential conflict.

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

<b>VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b>
--------------------------------

***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.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
USFWS	B	\$29,000	To support the fundraising training
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	

***\*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.***

The project ends at the same time when the CEPF Sumatra portfolio also ends. However, together with the CEPF Sumatra Grant Making project helped disburse money to 71 different projects, in addition to strengthening partnerships in Sumatra.

## **VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **VIII. INFORMATION SHARING**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

Name: Muhammad Farid

Organization name: Conservation International Indonesia

Mailing address: Jl. Pejaten Barat 16A. Jakarta 12550.Indonesia

Tel: +62 21 7883 8624

Fax: + 62 21 780 6723

E-mail: [mfarid@conservation.org](mailto:mfarid@conservation.org)