

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
				Review date:	08/24/2006
GEF Project ID:	1424		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)	
IA/EA Project ID:	076739	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.940000	0.939875	
Project Name:	Indonesia Forests and Media Project (INFORM)	IA/EA own:	0.00	0.00	
Country:	Indonesia	Government:	0.00	0.00	
		Other*:	0.292055	0.432456	
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.292055	0.432456	
Operational Program:	STRM, 3	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.232055	1.372331	
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	Conservation International Indonesia, on behalf of the INFORM Consortium	Work Program date			
		CEO Endorsement		11/09/2001	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		10/11/2002	
		Closing Date	Proposed: 03/31/2004	Actual: September 2004	
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 18 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 24 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 6 months	
Author of TE:		TE completion date: 02/09/2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: 09/21/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 7 months	

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	<b>S</b>	-	-	<b>S</b>
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>L</b>	<b>N/A</b>	-	<b>U/A</b>
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	<b>S</b>	-	-	<b>S</b>
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	-	<b>S</b>

<p><b>Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?</b> Yes. The TE provides all the required information in a very clear and complete way.</p>
<p><b>Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?</b> No.</p>

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The goal of the project was to improve forest protection by creating an upwelling of interest and concern among the general public and key decision-makers concerning the critical, potentially terminal, loss of forest biodiversity in Sumatra and Kalimantan.

There was a minor change in the objectives of the project. The original objective in the project proposal doc has been listed as: "The project's primary objective is to stimulate better forest protection through the creation of an upwelling of interest, concern – and especially action - among the general public and key decision-makers." Thus, the objective has been made more elaborate as on which issues awareness will be enhanced.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

1. Increase media coverage of critical forest loss issues in Indonesia by enhancing the role of journalists as responsible information and communication agents, including as a conduit for public information dissemination and feedback related to forest loss.
2. Contribute to public debate on emerging forest loss issues in order to influence and monitor policy development.
3. Increase public awareness of the forest loss issue in Indonesia and its social and environmental consequences.

The project document and project agreement review (2001) include a fourth objective ("Demonstrate the public interest and concern"), which seems to have been dropped.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to the TE, there were 4 major outcomes:

1. Targeted and accurate information on forest loss and its consequences was widely disseminated through various channels to change knowledge, attitude and behavior.
2. General public and others were able to seek further accurate and relevant information on conservation-related forest issues.
3. New awareness translated into action directed at politicians to take steps to improve conservation and to address illegal exploitation of forest and forest resources.
4. Monitoring procedures and surveys were executed at the beginning, middle, and end of the project track changes in knowledge, attitude and behavior related to deforestation.

### 4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

#### 4.1 Outcomes

##### A Relevance

**Rating: HS**

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The outcomes of this short-term project were all relevant to GEF goals. The project implementation was both timely (during presidential election campaign) and urgent (forest biodiversity in Indonesia is seriously threatened due to the rampant rate of forest loss). The project provided a short-term response measure to ensure that the debate on forests is

raised to new levels; and attempted to catalyze effective social response, as well as an emerging constituency at local and national level, for conservation and sound management of natural forests.	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?</b></li> </ul>	
According to the TE, for some activities, the achievements were well beyond determined indicators. And while the outcome did not substantially change the practice of the target audience, it nevertheless significantly attracted the audience and had a positive impact on public attitude.	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b></li> </ul>	
<p>Though the INFORM Consortium did encounter a crisis when one of its members (Forest Watch Indonesia) chose to withdraw toward the end of the project (March 2004), the TE concludes that the project successfully implemented all of the activities specified in the grant. Efficiency was improved by institutionalizing many of its activities within the regular/ongoing programs of INFORM Consortium members and by forming a strategic alliance with GreenCOM, a USAID-funded project on illegal logging.</p> <p>An analysis of the efficiency achieved by the project public service announcements shows that they had a similar reach but had cost 6 times lower than a political campaign that took place at the same time.</p> <p>There was a 6 month project extension which was fully funded by INFORM Consortium members.</p>	

<b>Impacts</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b></li> </ul> <p>According to the TE, although the pre- and post- campaign survey showed that, statistically, the results are not sufficient to claim an independent impact of the INFORM campaign on changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices concerning forest management in Indonesia; it did have a significant impact on raising awareness on this issue.</p> <p>The TE acknowledges that it was overly ambitious to expect to achieve the hoped-for and necessary impacts considering the short duration of the project, the size and complexity of the issue addressed and the diversity of Indonesia itself.</p>

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The Project Brief identifies that a key risk of the project is the hardening of people to unpleasant news, with responses of hopelessness to the serious deforestation crisis. There is also a risk that because of the short duration of the project, the impact it had on the Indonesian population will also be short-term.	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The INFORM network collaboration was very successful; so it can be expected that the positive	

collaboration initiated under this project will be maintained and adapted for addressing other key conservation issues.	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
N/A	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: <b>L</b>	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>1. Production of a public good</b>
-
<b>2. Demonstration</b>
This project was all about “getting the message out”. Its main objective was to increase the public awareness of the forest crisis in Indonesia so all activities were related to outreach and dissemination of relevant information. Project outputs included various communication products such as videos, documentaries, and radio programs, which were widely distributed throughout Indonesia.
<b>3. Replication</b>
INFORM was the first campaign project implemented by a Consortium of conservation organizations in Indonesia, and this innovative partner scheme has spread to other conservation efforts (examples include the Marine Conservation Trust Fund and the evolving Sumatra Trust Fund)
<b>4. Scaling up</b>
-

#### 4.4 Assessment of the project’s monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<b>A. In retrospect, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b>	<b>Rating: HS</b>
Due to the nature of the project, which was an aware-raising public campaign, the M&E system was designed with a clear set of targets, indicators and an effective methodology of data collection. Planned M&E activities included daily scanning of media coverage and representative surveys. Regular meetings of both the Steering Committee and the technical team (more frequent) were also scheduled.	
<b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
The project M&E system was an integral part of the project. All activities were carefully monitored and results from the surveys played an important role in the development of the campaigns and their messages. In addition, messages were tested prior to their distribution so as to ensure that target audiences received the message content properly. The TE finds that the design and planning of the campaign would have been enriched and	

strengthened if the baseline survey had been carried out before the inception workshop.
<b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? Rating: S</b>
Actual cost of M&E activities was 12.5% higher than budgeted. The TE does not mention if this is due to lack of efficiency, or because more activities were included, or just due to wrong budgeting.
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b> Yes. A very detailed monitoring protocol was designed and successfully implemented during the duration of the project. All necessary data was obtained from pre-identified sources and thru surveys tailored at specific audiences. The project made good use of monitoring methodologies and systems that are widely used by the publicity and marketing fields (monitoring of TV ratings, information on newspaper circulation, etc).

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b>
Most lessons mentioned in the TE are related to the design and implementation of public campaigns and how to better adapt them to specific characteristics/needs of environmental issues. The main lesson pertaining the management of the INFORM Consortium that is applicable to other partnerships is that time and effort are required to lay the groundwork for the partnership itself before focusing on project implementation. This allows partners to have mutual understanding, agreement and clear goals, objectives, benefits, mechanisms of project implementation, roles and responsibilities and a well-functioning communication system.

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No additional information was available to the reviewer.

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Yes. Project outcomes, indicators and achievements are clearly described in a table.	S
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> Yes. The TE presents complete and consistent evidence, but gives no ratings.	S
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Sustainability was assessed in terms of implementation of activities designed to provide sustainability (capacity building, institutionalization of project activities	S

within existing activities of INFORM Consortium members, etc). The TE also mentions future actions that the Consortium will take in order to continue the campaign efforts.	
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The TE author gives a well-thought and comprehensive set of lessons for each of the achieved outcomes.	HS
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> Yes.	HS
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The TE describes the M&E system and the results from the surveys and it provides a good analysis of public service announcements monitoring.	S

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No: X</b>
-------------	--------------

Explain: It would be difficult to do because the results from the project M&E are not sufficient to claim an independent impact of the INFORM campaign on changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices concerning forest management in Indonesia.

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

PIR 2004, Project document, Project Agreement Review (2001)