

FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Name: Conservation International Indonesia (CI-I)

Project Title: CEPF Conservation Strategy Preparatory Work in Sumatra

Project Dates: January 200 – August 2002

Date of Report: January 30, 2003

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

This project was proposed to refine the strategy for CEPF's 5-year funding investment in Sumatra. This was accomplished through site visits to three of the four priority sites identified in the CEPF Sumatra Ecosystem Profile. The work included meeting with local NGOs and communities to introduce the CEPF, meeting with international NGOs working on the ground in Sumatra and identifying potential partners for CI-Indonesia's work in Sumatra. Baseline maps for the areas were developed and a workshop conducted to develop agreed-upon maps illustrating how these areas might look in 5 years if the work of NGOs and other actors is successful.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

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

This project has been successful in achieving its impact objectives and performance indicators:

1. CI-I and other potential grantees articulate preliminary set of strategy-based proposals to CEPF and effectively contribute to the coordination of the CEPF portfolio.
 - 1.1 Coordination mechanism for CEPF is developed and implemented by June 2002.
 - The objective of this mechanism is a plan to strengthen relationships (build alliances) with international NGOs and major local NGOs working in Sumatra to design and implement conservation projects. Based on a mutually agreeable recommendation, one international NGO will assume a coordinating role for CEPF in each priority area:
 - o Bukit Barisan Selatan: Wildlife Conservation Society
 - o Teso Nilo/Bukit Tiga Puluh: World Wildlife Fund – Indonesia
 - o Seulawah/Leuser/Angkola: Conservation International – Indonesia
 - o Siberut Island: Conservation International – Indonesia
 - Responsibilities associated with this coordinating role include:
 - o Identifying other appropriate stakeholders/actors in the area and facilitating an introduction to CEPF.
 - o Assessing capacity needs of other stakeholders/actors in the area.
 - o In consultation with other lead organizations, synchronizing the labels and layers being used in the baseline and 5-year vision maps in the four areas.
 - o Consulting with other stakeholder organizations in their area to develop baseline maps that clearly show existing conditions (with agreed-upon layers).
 - o Conducting a workshop in consultation with other stakeholder organizations in their area to develop a 5-year "vision" map as to what the area might look like if agreed-upon conservation initiatives are successful (with agreed-upon layers).
 - o Facilitating a strategic planning framework for activities in their area, working together with the other lead organizations to ensure that methodology is consistent across Sumatra.
 - o Interacting regularly with the other lead organizations to identify needs and to work towards a Sumatra-wide strategy that integrates plans for the four areas.

- o Developing recommendations for a mechanism to advise and manage CEPF in their area (recognizing that it also may be necessary to develop an overarching mechanism to oversee CEPF across all four areas in Sumatra).
 - Each of these organizations has submitted a proposal to CEPF to lay the foundation for preliminary work to take on a coordination/leadership role and to develop baseline and 5-year vision maps.
- 1.2 A minimum of three other project proposals articulated to cover efforts over the next 2-3 years for CI-I.
- CII is developing and submitted several proposal to CEPF including:
 - o Conservation Assessment and Management Plan for Threatened Sumatran Species and Red List Assessment of Threatened Reptiles and Freshwater Fish
 - o Northern Sumatra Corridor Action Planning
 - o Establishing Orangutan Protection Units in the Northern Sumatra Corridor
 - o Orangutan Conservation in the Leuser Ecosystem
 - o Siberut Community-Based Conservation Management

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The most apparent impact of the CEPF socialization workshops is the forming of several NGO consortiums in each of the areas of geographic focus. The process was initiated by several leading local NGOs outside of the “appointed” leading international NGOs such as CI, WWF, and WCS. The positive impact is that with CEPF presence in Sumatra, the local NGOs are starting to work collaboratively to achieve mutual goals, something that really lacking in the past.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

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

The project was successful in that all project outputs were completed.

1. KEY CEPF AND CI-DC STAFF INTRODUCED TO HIGH PRIORITY SITES AND ACTORS/ STAKEHOLDERS WORKING IN THOSE SITES.

1.1. One trip (including two CEPF staff, one Conservation Economics, two CI-DC, Indonesia country director and one CI-I senior staff) to Teso Nilo, Gunung Leuser Ecosystem, and Bukit Barisan Selatan in February 2002.

- CI-I, WWF-IP, and WCS-IP were responsible for the following tasks:
 - o carrying out logistical arrangements
 - o organizing meetings with local actors
 - o conducting travel, preparing trip reports and follow-up with local organizations
- A series of workshops were conducted in Pekanbaru, Bandar Lampung, Medan, and Siberut to introduce and socialize the CEPF program in Sumatra.

1.2. Trip report completed by 1 March 2002.

Compilation of trip reports is available upon request.

2. A PLAN TO STRENGTHEN RELATIONSHIPS WITH INTERNATIONAL NGOS AND MAJOR LOCAL NGOS WORKING IN SUMATRA DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED.

2.1. Meetings with WWF, WCS, WALHI and other NGOs, together with CEPF and CI-I and CI-DC staff, completed in February 2002.

- A meeting was hosted by CI-I Jakarta on February 11 for Jakarta-Bogor based conservation institutions (including NGOs, universities & governments) to invite them in supporting CEPF’s program in Sumatra.

2.2. Baseline map for Northern Sumatra and Aceh completed by 28 February 2002.

- In conjunction with previous baseline data compilation for the creation of the Sumatra's Ecosystem Profile, forest-non forestland cover classification was carried out in CI-I 's GIS/Remote Sensing lab using satellite imagery analyses. The area analyzed covered the entire CEPF geographic focus including the Northern Sumatra Corridor, Teso Nilo-Bukit Tiga Puluh National Park, Siberut island, and Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park. The layer then also was shared with the other leading institutions.

2.3. Five-year vision map for Northern Sumatra and Aceh completed by 15 April 2002 (extended until October 2002)

- The process involving the 5-year strategy (vision map) workshops:
 - o Develop common conservation vision and mission among stakeholders
 - o Develop conservation alliance within each geographic focus.
 - o Develop 'rough grain' conservation strategy with the following inputs:
 - Assessment of threat and opportunity
 - Prioritization of target area within geographic foci.
 - Analyses of the stakeholders and institutional capacity
 - Selecting outputs and activities taking into account strengths and constraints.
 - o CI-I has completed the vision maps for the Northern Sumatra Corridor and Siberut. The narrative report for the Northern Sumatra Corridor has been delivered to CEPF, but the narrative report for Siberut still is under revision (anticipated completion no later than December 31, 2002).

2.4. Workshop with key organizations from Teso Nilo and Bukit Barisan Selatan completed by 30 May 2002.

- The meeting was called to follow up on the CEPF socialization trip. The three institutions (CI, WWF, WCS) agreed to play a coordinating role in their respective geographic focal areas.

The discussions included:

1. Identifying other appropriate stakeholders/actors in the area and facilitating an introduction to CEPF.
 - a. WWF facilitated the establishment of a 22-member NGO consortium in Riau and desire to expand it to Jambi NGOs as well, to cover Bukit Tiga Puluh National Park.
 - b. WCS will initiate development of a consortium, and raised a concern over the capability and credibility of the majority of the local NGOs.
 - c. For Aceh/Seulawah, there already are four established NGO consortiums. At the time of the meeting, CI was not a member. There was confusion concerning CI representation for northern Sumatra, particularly centering on confusion over whether CI and CEPF are separate institutions. CI will develop the consortium for North Sumatra.
2. Assessing capacity building needs in other stakeholders/actors in the area.
 - a. Indecon will use the information gathered to make additional recommendations and carry out additional analyses.
 - b. WCS suggested having NGO development officers for each region, hosted by the lead institutions.
3. In consultation with other lead organizations, synchronizing the labels and layers being used in GIS maps in the four areas.
 - a. GIS staff from each institution met and discussed technical implementation of the mapping exercise, with CI-I GIS staff leading discussions on data sharing, needs, and gaps.
4. Consulting with other stakeholder organizations in their area to develop baseline maps that clearly show existing conditions (with agreed-upon layers).
 - a. WWF and WCS developed preliminary maps based on 5-year predictions of forest lost using GIS analyses.
5. Conducting a series of workshops in consultation with other stakeholder organizations in each organization's respective area to develop a 5-year "vision" map -- what the area might look like if agreed-upon conservation initiatives are successful (with agreed-upon layers).

- a. The three organizations developed the methodology together, based on the examples from the CI Andes exercise.

2.5. Final consensus map for Sumatra completed by 30 June 2002 (Pending, awaiting the results for Teso Nilo, Bukit Tiga Puluh National Park and Bukit Barisan National Park).

- Organizing a set of meetings in conjunction with site visits in Sumatra or in Jakarta.
- Presenting the CEPF funding mechanism and coordination needs.
- Co-designing a coordination strategy for CEPF with key players including a consensually-developed conservation strategy for the four priority areas by 30 April 2002 and compilation of the final consensus map.

3. CI'S ROLE IN COORDINATING CEPF IN SUMATRA CLARIFIED.

3.1. Follow-up meetings with international NGOs to determine overarching coordination mechanism for CEPF conducted.

3.2. Recommendations for CEPF coordination submitted to CEPF by 28 February 2002.

- CI's role in coordinating CEPF in Sumatra clarified. Additionally, CI-I is housing a Grant manager (Sari Surjadi) for the CEPF program in its Jakarta office. Depending on the needs of the CEPF, this position was proposed to provide full- or part-time coordination of all CEPF work in Sumatra, with direct reporting to the CEPF Asia Grants Director.

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

No outputs were unrealized, however there was a slight delay in the implementation of the vision map creation activities. This is mainly attributable to:

- o lack of intensive internal planning process before project implementation
- o lack of guidelines from CEPF for vision mapping process implementation
- o the need for improved communication between CI-I and CEPF

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

This project has had no direct negative implication to the points specified in the environmental and social safeguard policies.

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.

1. Managing stakeholders'/partners' expectations:
 - Development of stakeholder profiles should include governmental institutions relevant to natural resource management.
 - There is a need to "nurture" the consortiums established as a result of the CEPF socialization.
 - There is a need to clarify to stakeholders the difference between CI's and CEPF's role.
 - There is a need to clarify the World's Bank contribution in CEPF, in terms of CEPF awarding grants not loans. Additionally, some confusion exists as to the source of the funding (e.g., several stakeholders have asked if the funds are left over from the war in Afghanistan).
2. Integrating Information for the creation of the maps:
 - General baseline data only available for particular sites or species (patchy).
 - Scientific data remains "difficult" for local stakeholders to grapple with (including data sharing).
 - Indigenous knowledge has not traditionally been linked to conservation efforts.

3. Design of the vision maps
 - Spatial design should be based on the biodiversity priorities and evaluation forest cover areas.
 - Multiple stakeholders should be encouraged to participate in the consultation process early on.
 - Maps should continue being refined based on available information updates.

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

See lessons learned above.

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

The way in which the vision strategy was developed contributed to the project's success. In particular, these elements included:

- Identifying areas of concern needed to work toward a corridor landscape design.
- Defining species outcomes (extinction avoided) based on known species distribution data and overlaying these with a corridor approach.

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Feedback received during the stakeholder consultation process included the following recommendations/comments:

- CI-I and CEPF need to facilitate capacity building program for NGOs and development of district level networks including the communication mechanisms.
- CI-I should focus on areas other than Leuser as the LDP is still well-funded.
- Synchronize program with governments (BAPPEDA, BAPEDALDA, KSDA, etc.) programs to leverage funds.
- Not all stakeholders agree with the visioning process, but still are willing to participate, especially if funding results.
- Programs (projects) should be realistic, responsible, and transparent.
- CEPF should sensibly consider local community involvement.
- CEPF should not discriminate in providing support, as long as the projects results are concrete and really contribute to conservation efforts.
- CEPF should move forward as soon as possible with projects as there already have been enough planning workshops.
- There should be a synergy between conservation and social aspects for the benefit of local communities.

For more information about this project, please contact:

Susie Ellis
Conservation International
1919 M Street, NW Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-912-1000
Fax: 202-912-1046
E-mail: s.ellis@conservation.org
www.conservation.org