

CEPF Small Grant Final Project Completion Report

Complete the following report worksheet to provide CEPF with an overall summary of the results of your project. Within the narrative section, responses should be concise, but include sufficient detail to present a clear understanding of the development and progression of this project.

Date of Report (MM/DD/YY)
September 17, 2003

Organization Information
Organization Name
Yayasan Cipta Citra Lestari Indonesia/YCCLI
Project Name
Training on Biodiversity Survey Methodology for Multi Stakeholders in North Sumatera Province
Project Dates (as stated in the contract agreement)
November 25, 2002 until July 15, 2003
Partners
<input type="checkbox"/> YAYASAN BIOTA LESTARI <input type="checkbox"/> YAYASAN KANOPI <input type="checkbox"/> CI Medan <input type="checkbox"/> FFI - SECP <input type="checkbox"/> KOMPAS USU <input type="checkbox"/> MAPALA UMSU <input type="checkbox"/> GMPA – ITM <input type="checkbox"/> LMU (Leuser Management Unit/Yayasan Leuser International)

Project Description – Provide a brief description of the project your team implemented.

Natural resources management requires multi-stakeholders participation. It can be done with assumption that local human resources have ability to effectively and efficiently manage their area. Laws No. 25 about “District Autonomy” and Law No. 5/1990 about “Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem” support the multi-stakeholders participation. In article no 4 of the latter Law stated “The conservation of natural resources biodiversity and its ecosystem is the responsibility of Government and Community”

In order to enhance local capacity in the field of biodiversity survey, CCLI conducted a training titled “Biodiversity Survey Methodology for Multi Stakeholders in Angkola Ecosystem Area, Mandailing Natal, North Sumatera Province, Indonesia”, from January 25 to February 2, 2003.

There were 23 participants from local NGO, Nature Lover Clubs from University, and Government Agencies like BKSDA I, BKSDA II and Forestry Service from South Tapanuli and Mandailing Natal province.

Training took place in two different places, for theory in Balai Diklat Penerbangan at Jl. Jamin Ginting, Medan; whilst fieldwork took place in Sibanggor Julu village, Kotanopan sub district, Mandailing Natal district. Material given during training was methodology on vegetation survey, mammal, primate, aves, herpetofauna, and social economy survey methodology and practical photography.

Narrative Questions

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

- To enhance multi-stakeholders’ knowledge on methodology of biodiversity survey
- To enhance capability in conducting field survey.
- To enhance capability in data collection and data analysis in the conservation of critical ecosystem area in North Sumatera.

2. Did the objectives of your project change during implementation? If so, please explain why and how.

The project objectives did not change; it was the same with initial objectives set out in the beginning. The project objective changed because there was still unused budget, which used for dissemination of training material guidebook for participants and also for those who helped the project execution.

3. How was your project successful in achieving the expected objectives?

In understanding the objectives accomplishment, at the end of training we distributed a sealed questionnaire that should be filled by participants. The results of training evaluation by participants:

No	Questions	Results	(%)
1.	What do you think about the module given during the training?		
	a. Very bad	0	0
	b. Bad	0	0
	c. Fair	13	59,09
	d. Good	8	36,36
	e. Very good	1	4,55
2.	What do you think about the training material presentation methods used by the speakers?		
	a. Very bad	0	0
	b. Bad	0	0
	c. Fair	12	54,55
	d. Good	10	45,45
	e. Very good	0	0
3.	According to you did the training in accordance with training theme?		
	a. Not at all	0	0
	b. No	0	0
	c. Fair	11	50,00
	d. In accordance with	11	50,00
	e. Entirely in accordance with	0	0
4.	Was the training according to your expectations		
	a. Not at all	0	0
	b. No	5	22,727
	c. Fair	16	72,727
	d. In accordance with	1	4,55
	e. Entirely in accordance with	0	0
5.	What do you think about the complete training from the indoor to outdoor activities		
	a. Very bad	0	0
	b. Bad	3	13,636
	c. Fair	19	86,364
	d. Good	0	0
	e. Very good	0	0
6.	Would you or your organization need a field guide book to do Methodology on Biodiversity Survey		
	a. Do not know	0	0
	b. Do not need	0	0
	c. Necessary	3	13,636
	d. Very	19	86,364

The answers to six questions on the questionnaire are enough to point out that training was in accordance with the initial objectives. Other than questionnaires, we also directly observed participants development from the beginning until the end of training. Theories (data sampling method, data tabulation and data analysis) that delivered in Medan were well comprehended and applied by participants assisted with instructors.

4. Did your team experience any disappointments or failures during implementation? If so, please explain and comment on how the team addressed these disappointments and/or failures.

In general we were successful in conducting the project. Project personnel whether as organizer, instructors, and participants were very supportive. Furthermore support from the chief of BKSDA I SUMUT, BKSDA II SUMUT, Forestry Service Mandailing Natal District, Head of Mandailing Natal District and Sibanggor Julu community, where training was conducted. There was a small disturbance at the first night of training while we delivered general briefing to the participants on next-days activities. One of participants represented a local NGO – YES - questioned the present of Word Bank within CEPF. It looked as is the person made a provocation toward other participants with hope the project would fail. The way we handle the situation was:

1. Based on our knowledge, that night we explained to the participants about CEPF and the present of Word Bank within CEPF based on our knowledge.
2. During the activities in Medan or fieldwork, we always conducted approach to the participants in the form of brainstorming and explanations. The explanations were about the presence of CEPF as the funder on this project and YCCLI as project organizer did not have negative intentions or would exploit participants; that the organizer's presence was purely to develop them in all fields especially in the field of biodiversity survey methodology. The approach was proved to be effective based on their growing confidence on the organizer's real objectives. They showed it by seriously followed training process from the beginning until the end and the good network preserve until now.

5. Describe any positive or negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.

Lessons learned from the project that might adoptable to other organizations:

1. Positive lessons learned: Organizing Committee included some personnel from some NGOs (Yayasan Biota Lestari, Yayasan KANOPI, Mapala UMSU, Kompas USU, GMPA ITM). We considered this as a appositive note because (1) they had sense of belonging or being part of the project and problems faced by their area, (2) they were able to learn on how to coordinate activities similar with the project, (3) we were able to maintain partnership amongst organizations and network for next programs.
2. Negative lessons learned: the negative side was insignificant but it caused slower pace on our activity. Members of our organizing committee consisted of different personnel from different organizations with different vision, mission and work schedules. Fortunately, it was resolved by maintaining mutual understanding and the growing trust, transparency and responsibility on tasks we delivered to them.

6. Describe any follow-up activities related to this project.

Follow-up activities related to this project:

- ❑ *Short-term activities.* The making of a field guidebook representative enough for fieldwork. This activity supported with questionnaires results that showed that they require a guidebook for field biodiversity survey.
- ❑ *Long-term activities.* The existence of biological diversity survey projects in Angkola Ecosystem Area, where they or at least the organization participated in the training could participate in the projects. Through the projects they would have opportunities to strengthen knowledge obtained during the training. After that they would be able to organizationally independent plan, conduct, and report their projects. The minimum number of data on biological diversity in Angkola Ecosystem Area supports the need for these survey projects.

7. Please provide any additional information to assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.

During the fieldwork activities in Sibanggor Julu village, we always observed the local communities' condition and conducted discussions with villagers, especially the chief village in Sibanggor Julu village. It appears that the area has high natural resources and human resources potency but it has not been utilized to the maximum. A land misuse occurs in the area. The status of forest area where fieldwork training took place is protected forest. Within the protected forest, there is a 25-Ha area located app. 3 km from the village. The Mandailing Natal District Forestry Service designates the area as Arboretum. But, the local community has used the 25-ha area as orange plantation. In order to anticipate the matter there should be intensive community development program in Sibanggor Julu village in particular and other areas within Angkola Ecosystem Area (Mandailing Natal and South Tapanuli district).

The width of Protected Forest/Protected Area in Kabupaten Mandailing Natal district is app. 179.658,25 Ha. The protected forest considered as critical land is app. 40.042,60 Ha. (Source: BIPHUT Area I Medan based on *Paduserasi RTRWP* Mapping with *TGHK*). So, there is app. 139.615,65 Ha protected forest contains high biodiversity that still can be saved. According to the statements by the vice of Mandailing Natal district head, Ir. H. Masruddin Dalimunthe, on a direct discussion at his residence, the protected forest status was agreed by Forestry Service, The Local People Assembly II and other local governments bodies. So, there is opportunity the area to be saved as biodiversity conservation area. Therefore, it is suggested to CEPF that there should be immediate response to this matter. Activities should be focused on supporting policy to save biodiversity in Mandailing Natal Protected Forest Area that is part of Angkola Ecosystem Area. The area is wider than the 130.000 Ha Way Kambas National Park.