

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)
May 5, 2003

Organization Information
Organization Name
SKEPHI (Sekretariat Kerjasama untuk Pelestarian Hutan Indonesia)
Project Name
<i>Investigation and Campaign About Biodiversity Concerns Related to the Ladiagalasko Road Development Plan</i>
Project Dates (as stated in the contract agreement)
September 1, 2002 – December 31, 2002

Partners

ALLIANCE OF NON-POLITICAL ORGANIZATION IN INDONESIA WHO AGAINST THE LADIA GALASKA ROAD PLAN. THE ALLIANCE WHICH ESTABLISHED DURING THE PROJECT CONSIST OF:

1. PBHI (Indonesian Legal and Human Rights Association)
2. FKP 61 (Farmer Communication Forum, Medan)
3. KPHKEL Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam & North Sumatra
4. Farmer Advocating Institution (Lembaga Advokasi Petani = LAP), Medan
5. Communication Forum of Karo Farmer (Forum Komunikasi Petani Karo), Brastagi, North Sumatra
6. Konphalindo, Jakarta
7. Alliance of Independent Journalist (Aliansi Jurnalis Independen = AJI)
8. Alliance of the Nusantara Customary Community (Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara = AMAN)
9. JARI, Jakarta
10. ELSAM, Jakarta ----- after some time it was also supported by
11. Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW)
12. Conservation International – Indonesia Program
13. Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI)
14. KEHATI
15. PELANGI
16. YLBHI
17. IHSA (Institut Kajian Hukum Sumber Daya Alam)
18. National Executive WALHI
19. WALHI Aceh
20. LATIN
21. ICEL (Indonesian Center for Environmental Law)
22. TELAPAK
23. KOMPALA (Komite Penyelamat Lingkungan Aceh)
24. SKEPHI

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

- Field Investigation, press meeting, press coverage
- The forming of Non-political Alliance at local and national level
- Dialogue with Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Forestry, Sub commission Environment (Commission VIII), DPR-RI
- Participation of SKEPHI and other NGOs in Collaborative Team who re-evaluate the Ladia Galaska road plan.
- Workshop
- Intensive media coverage during the project
- Joint letter of non-political alliance demands the fund blocking of Ladia Galaska road plan.
- The statement by RI president who suggested a re-evaluation of Ladia Galaska road plan
- Joint statement of Indonesian and Japan NGOs
- SKEPHI press meeting and statement in CGI meeting in Bali
- Support from individual and NGO at international level through emailing campaign (Harvard Law School, Sumatran Orang Utan Society, Rettet and Regewald e.V – Germany, Environmental Defense Fund, etc)
- Statements by the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Forestry and member of Sub commission of environment (VIII Commission), which insisted a re-evaluation of Ladia Galaska road plan.

Narrative Questions

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

To conduct field investigation and workshop to inform related government agencies (the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Kimpraswil, and Governor of NAD province about biodiversity concerns related to the Ladia Galaska road plan execution.

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

No, the objectives did not change during implementation

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

- Field investigation and mass media coverage.
- The establishment of a relatively huge and varied non-political organization alliance.
- The agreement from related government departments to re-evaluate the Ladia Galaska road project.
- There were pressures from international community.
- Intensive and long-term media coverage.
- Critical movements on the Ladia Galaska road development amongst the government, national legislative, international donor, and general public.
- The increase engagement of the local community in NAD province.

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.

- The uninformed behavior of related government agencies toward critical movements by NGO. It was handled by intensifying communications efforts, such as press releases, mailings, collaboration amongst NGOs, and meetings with related Ministries.
- The above situation and the complexity of situation, which involved other departments, forced us to first handle this situation. The second part of the project, which was the workshop, was postponed and so the end of the project was ended later than the original time scheduled.

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.

- Negative lessons: project duration which determined by the project executor, was too short, when this project involved a combination of public and media work, policy study, and advocacy which consumed huge amount of time.
- Positive lessons: a) the collective support and direct involvement of many NGOs, in spite of the much time spent, would eventually bear rewarding results, b) the initial resistance of related departments could be changed through increasing communication, whether at national or international level, including from the World Bank to Indonesian government.

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

A follow-up proposal to CEPF Program for the next one-year of activities. The activities are:

- Diagnostic stage: discussions with the LMU, the Leuser International Foundation, core partner NGOs and related government officials in order to strengthen the role of the Leuser Development Program implementer and to press for and streamline the supportive role of government offices.
- Dialogue stage: TV -debates, hearing at the national Parliament (all involving local and national NGOs and government officials and prominent public figures).
- Output stage: a symposium involving local, national and international NGOs to deliver broad support to a strengthened legal and financial basis for the conservation of the Leuser Ecosystem.

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

- Report of the field investigation (Bahasa Indonesia)
- Report of the workshop (Bahasa Indonesia)
- English translation of the letter of the State Minister of National Develop Planning to the Governor of Aceh, January 2003
- Briefing document on road network through the Leuser Ecosystem, January 2003
- Points of Actions proposed by the NGO Alliance to the Minister of Environment (Bahasa Indonesia), October 2003
- Corruption of donor loans exposed (1), Jakarta Post, January 2003
- Idem (2), January 2003
- Action alert by the Environmental Defense Funds, March 2003
- "Aceh a fragile peace", press release by the International Crisis Group, 27 February 2003
- Ladia Galaska road plan issues, January 2003
- International petition to the World Bank, status 10th of March 2003
- Statement by SKEPHI to CGI meeting in Bali, 21 January 2003
- Alert mailing by SKEPHI to all ambassadors and regional and country directors of donor countries, February 2003
- Letter SKEPHI to the World Bank in Jakarta, May 2002
- Reply of the World Bank in Jakarta to SKEPHI, August 2002
- Letter by SKEPHI to the State Minister of National Development Planning, 4 November 2002
- Briefing document on the Leuser Development Program, January 2003
- English translation of the the NGO Alliance statement to the Minister of Finance
- Press coverage will be submitted upon request owing to the large number of publicity