

# CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Tony Djogo

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Review of the Co-Management Model for Siberut National Park

**Implementation Partners for This Project:** CI, UNESCO, CMP Tropenbos Indonesia Program and Siberut National Park Agency.

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** Mar 1, 2006-Jul 31, 2006

**Date of Report (month/year):** December 2006

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

Co-Management Project in Siberut, a project sponsored by UNESCO has been implemented over five years until this assessment was conducted. This project has achieved certain degree of success but also encountered substantial challenges and constraints.

There are problems or key issues related to local social, economic and political situation, institutions and policy support. The project encountered problems in working local communities as well as the government institutions. The project aim to combine conservation and development have often hampered by these issues.

As in many projects, community development component as well as institutional mechanisms for collaboration with government organizations was the most difficult aspects that influence the overall performance of the project. The project often encounter problem in working with non-governmental organizations.

This evaluation report proposes several recommendations for improvements. There are opportunities for improvements but a significant reorientation of the project as well as the redesign of the project as well as the improvement of approaches and methodologies need to be taken into considerations.

The strength and opportunities for improvement lies in the project scale that works with local communities at the village level. However, this endeavor often was not sufficient enough to provide the foundation for equitable and sustainable output and outcomes or impacts.

The project also working with appropriate technologies identified and designed based on the assessment conducted adopting participatory rural appraisal. However, lack of support from policy process and other related institutions has caused the project should reduce its ambition to work in many places or larger scale of the national park.

Field technical staff also lack of knowledge, skills and experiences in working with practical and small scale project through appropriate community approach and development as well as technical design.

### III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The objective of this is to conduct an analysis of the current collaborative management model of the Siberut National Park (Co-Management Project or CMP). Based on the review of the project strengths and weaknesses, it is aimed at providing recommendations for improvement to this management model. The analysis and improvement need to take into account local socio-cultural, economic and political characteristics, biophysical conditions, organization and institutional issues and management and administrative aspects of the project.

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

No! The objectives of the study are remaining the same as they are designed in the project preparation. The LOI and TOR are designed in participatory processes. The LOI and the TOR are designed in a participatory process by incorporating inputs and suggestions from CI and UNESCO as well as the CMP implementing organization.

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

The project has achieved most of its objectives but some of the objectives could not be met. The project has completed the analysis and provided recommendations. The next step should be the presentation of the findings this study to the Ministry of Forestry's Directorate General of Forest Protection and the Nature Conservation. However there was no opportunity has been gained to undertake this task. The target of this task was to engage and contribute to policy process and designing regulation related to community based and collaborative management of the national park.

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 study team has tried to be neutral and professional in exploring the strengths and weaknesses of the CMP project. There are, however, resistance from certain people working with CMP project as well as the National Park who may field being criticized or humiliated.

The team also encountered serious challenges from the project and UNESCO related to the findings and recommendations as if the team has humiliated the project. In fact the team as tried to expose the weaknesses, threats, constraints or challenges as much as possible based on the real situation in the field that hampered the success of the CMP. The team of this study has also exposed the strengths, success and opportunities for improving the CMP Project. But the CMP staffs and consultants seems to be defensive. But them some consensus have been achieved to minimized the friction between the

CMP project and the study team. Several consultative meetings involving the third parties have helped both parties to reach consensus about the report style and criticisms over the project.

The local government organizations are not very cooperative in discussing the project. Local government who should play the key roles in supporting community development and conservation in fact are more politicized by the orientation of power and authority and their business interests. Local governments are more interested in economic and physical infrastructure development rather than conservation and community development. The head of the national park agency has also demonstrated very limited interest and support to this project. There are only a few committed staffs who have demonstrated their individual commitment and interest exposed their concern about the future of the national park.

Field team often directed by the project staff only to visit the sites which already determined by the project. The project was design to visit several sites to get as much as representation of the problems, issues and facts related to the implementation and outcome of the CMP project.

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.

### **Positive Lessons**

- a. CMP has provided some good lessons related to its endeavor to work in risky circumstances with complicated local community socio, economic and cultural issues. The lessons from the five years project must have been very constructive for redesigning the better project.
- b. Local and central government could draw some lessons from the project to be incorporated into policy process and project design.
- c. This kind of study need to be implemented in other national park or conservation areas in several sites in Indonesia since thee are serious threats to the destruction of almost all conservation areas. However, it needs to be continued with practical project design to address the encountered issues to be implemented collaboratively by local community with government and non government organizations.
- d. The central government could draw the lessons from his project for its endeavor to design and promulgate central government regulation on collaborative forest management projects in conservation areas.
- e. The CMP had been working quite boldly in the remote areas with complex social and economic, cultural and political situation. CMP staffs often have to sacrifice their personal things, life and dedicated their time and energy to work with local communities.
- f. CMP has demonstrated the same failures that needed to be taken into account by other project combining conservation and development, involving livelihood economic development but at the same time should protect the environment which is under serious threats from external ad internal pressures.
- g. Some of the CMP staffs are very open to criticisms and accept whatever the evaluation of their project. They provided constructive feedback for the study

reports or findings. They are willing to make change in their development approach.

- h. CMP starts with good initiatives to work with small scale project. This should be maintained until CMP has built good foundation to expand its activities to other areas or with more diversified project component and activities.

### **Negative Lessons**

- a. Lack of support from both the local and the national government institutions may cause serious threats to the future of the Siberut national park.
- b. Lack of support from the NGOs and the absence of the private companies exploiting timber and other natural resources in Siberut have demonstrated the lack of collaboration and participation of the stakeholders in the region.
- c. There are problems with the capacity of the CMP which are often too ambitious to work with conservation and development efforts in large areas.
- d. As happened in many conservation and development project, CMP is often too ambitious to begin with certain project or new project. Some component of the project have been very much target oriented.
- e. There are too many component of the project in certain location without focus and look at the reality that the capacity and capability of the local community are limited.
- f. The introduction of cash crops or any livelihood alternative is a good attempt but market opportunities would be a serious constraint.
- g. Many people are still more interested in market and financial issues while the production systems might be still at the subsistence stage or very limited opportunity to engage into the market.
- h. The CMP is being implemented outside the national park, hence not really representing the whole situation and conditions to be addressed inside the national park.

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

The study team has proposes several possible follow up activities to be undertaken:

- a. Reduce the scale of the project focus on several villages that local people demonstrated their interests and willingness to continue with this project
- b. The project needs to scale down its unit management from village to hamlets or even to the household level, which will provide better foundation for a more sustainable project.
- c. CMP has been recommended to solicit support from other donors not just depending upon only UNESCO. UNESCO may dictate the project direction, design and its implementation. Support (technical and financial resources) need to be explored to request from other donor, local and central government as well as non government organizations.
- d. The findings of the study need to be presented to the central government for further discussion in policy and technical design process.

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

#### IV. 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
None			

**\*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.)*

#### V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**This project is a good idea to evaluate a small scale project on conservation and development efforts. This type of study need to be implemented in other conservation areas when funding and other resources are available. Whenever possible the CMP project needs to be improved and replicated in other conservation areas. It must be started with small scale project, appropriate design and implementation using appropriate community development approach and with small amount of money at the outset, a few ham lets and households.**

**I have observed and read various documents on giant project such as ICDP (Integrated Conservation and Development Project) which involved million of dollars but end up in a miserably abandoned project and local communities.**

**Whenever possible CEPF could support small scale CMP projects (or whatever its name) in selected conservation regions with possible opportunities for improvement taking into account combination of conservation and development involving not only technical aspects but also policy process.**

**It must be started with a participatory process of appraisal and technical design but involves government organizations and non government institutions.**

## VI. 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: Tony Djogo

Organization name: Independent Consultant at the time this project was implemented. Tony is currently working with RECOFTC as the Country Coordinator for Indonesia.

Mailing address: Bum Sentosa B1/9, Nanggewer Mekar, Cibinong, Bogor, West Java, 16912 Indonesia

Tel: +62- 21- 87906158, +62 (0) 81310030503

Fax: +62- 21- 87910730

E-mail: [tdjogo@yahoo.com](mailto:tdjogo@yahoo.com), [tdjogo@gmail.com](mailto:tdjogo@gmail.com)