

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2969	
GEF Agency project ID		98308	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Partnership for Conservation Management of the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park, North Maluku Province Indonesia	
Country/Countries		Indonesia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD SP1 - Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems OP3- Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Burung Indonesia	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead Executing agency, Burung Indonesia, is an NGO	
Private sector involvement		No private sector involvement (it was planned, but it did not materialize)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		05/07/2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		07/23/2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		05/30/2012	
Actual date of project completion		12/15/2012	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	Not provided	Not provided
	Co-financing	Not provided	Not provided
GEF Project Grant		0.999	0.930
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.405	0.261
	Government	0.410	1.936
	Other*	0.270	0.000
Total GEF funding		0.999	0.930
Total Co-financing		1.085	2.198
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.085	3.128
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		4/15/2013	
TE submission date		08/22/2013	
Author of TE		Tim Lamrock	
TER completion date		12/09/2013	
TER prepared by		Inela Weeks	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	MU	MU	Not Reviewed	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	ML	Not Reviewed	MU
M&E Design	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Reviewed	S
M&E Implementation	MS	Not Rated	Not Reviewed	S
Quality of Implementation	S	S	Not Reviewed	MS
Quality of Execution	MS	MS	Not Reviewed	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not Reviewed	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project: “Globally significant biodiversity of Aketajawe Lolobata National Park (ALNP) is conserved through an effective conservation management regime which has the active support of local stakeholders”.

The selection of Aketajawe-Lolobata was timely since the area, previously the site of commercial logging, had been: (a) recently designated as a national park and existed on paper only; (b) was weakly protected; and (c) had few management resources. Thus, the area remained vulnerable to continued degradation of both the forest and its unique bird populations.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective: “The enabling framework for collaborative management of protected areas in Indonesia is strengthened through promotion and replication of the Aketajawe-Lolobata project approach”.

The project had seven components and was to achieve the following outcomes: (a) establish an adequate basis of biological and social information for the management of the National Park; (b) develop an effective management regime for ALNP including facilitating bi-lateral agreements between the National Park and neighboring communities and industries, rationalizing and re-marking the boundaries of the National Park, establishing a multi-stakeholder forum to provide oversight, and working with District Government to integrate spatial planning and National Park management; (c) ensure that the National Park management and other stakeholders have adequate capacity (resources, skills, information) to play an effective role; (d) a monitoring system supports effective lesson learning and evaluation; (e) information and lessons from the project shared with other relevant institutions Indonesia; and (f) high levels of awareness and support amongst the public and decision makers in the three affected Districts and the main towns in North Maluku.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were **no revisions** to the development or the global environmental objectives. The project's seven components were also not revised. There were no significant changes made in design, scope, scale, or implementation arrangements during the course of the project.

The project's closure date was extended. This was a no cost extension for an additional 5 1/2 months until mid-December 2012.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

This project was designed to directly contribute to the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area, and its SP1 'Catalyzing Sustainability^[1] of Protected Areas' in two ways. First the project was to strengthen^[2] management of a newly-created "paper park" of 167,300 hectares (ha), which includes habitats and species not represented elsewhere in the national protected area network, thereby increasing representation in the PA network through expansion of conservation efforts into a critical bioregion. Second, the project was to contribute to sustainability through designing and piloting of a new model of collaborative management under a new central government policy that allows multi-stakeholder involvement in the management of national Park. This project is also consistent with OP3 – Forest Ecosystems, as it aims to afford proper protection and sustainable conservation to unique forest ecosystems of global significance and their threatened biodiversity. It was to achieve this through building constituency of support amongst local stakeholders including creating management agreements and enabling coordination through a structured multi-stakeholder forum.

The project contributes to many of the objectives and work programs of the Convention on Biological Diversity, especially the work program on protected areas adopted at COP7 and the work program on forests. In addition, as stated in the Project Document, as a nation of islands, Indonesia has an interest in the CBD's multi-year program of work on Island Biodiversity adopted at COP7. The work program notes the high levels of endemism and threat in island taxa, and the fragility of the ecosystems on which they and human livelihoods depend. This project aims to facilitate implementation of this program of work.

The Indonesian Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IBSAP) 2003-2020 published by the National Agency for Development Planning has as its vision: "An Indonesian society which is concerned, empowered, independent, and intelligent in conserving and utilizing biodiversity in an optimum, fair and sustainable manner through responsible management with the ultimate purpose of enhancing its community welfare". According to the Project Document, this project encapsulates that vision by taking an innovative and pilot approach to implementing a multi-stakeholder approach to protected area management, through fostering agreements between national park management, local government, communities and private sector supported by a transparent mechanism for implementation to secure a new national park of high biodiversity value. In terms of site-based interventions, the IBSAP highlights that the province of North Maluku, and specifically the island of Halmahera (where the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park is located), has some of the most important and least effectively protected biodiversity conservation sites in Indonesia.

Lastly, the newly declared Aketajawe- Lolobata National Park includes 167,300 ha of forest in an archipelago which is recognized as an Endemic Bird Area, an Important Bird Area, a Biodiversity Hotspot and a Global 200 Ecoregion, and is the only protected area in the archipelago with a near-complete representation of threatened and endemic taxa.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------	--

The project’s effectiveness is rated ‘Moderately Unsatisfactory’ in agreement with the ICM’s rating. The project was unsuccessful in fully achieving its ultimate PDO and GEO indicators. It is very important to note, especially given that the project had to start from a very low base, that the project made significant strides towards ultimately achieving these goals. The ICM notes that it is possible that the development objective may be achieved over time.

The global environmental objective has only been partially achieved, and the results are mixed. Two outcome indicators for the achievement of the GEO were partially achieved, while the third one was not achieved:

(1) Partially achieved - forest degradation has been reversed in the Lolobata block, but continues in the Aketajawe block. The establishment of ALNP has halted commercial logging within the Park, and has thus contributed to the reduction in the rate of degradation of the forest areas. Using Landsat7 ETM+ data and consistent interpretation methods, the total of primary and secondary forest areas in the Aketajawe block was approximately 70,500 ha, 73,500 ha and 66,500 ha in the years 2008, 2010, and 2012 respectively. For the Lolobata block, the areas were 74,500ha, 77,000ha and 78,900. Therefore, it could be said that forest degradation was halted and reversed in the Lolobata block, but not in the Aketajawe block where the total forest cover has been reduced. The information available to the National Park management unit enabled action to be taken against commercial logging concession holders operating outside their license terms, and also enabled the areas for proposals for new activities (e.g., roads, mining) to be

correctly identified and consequent measures to be taken to avoid negative impacts on the Park.

(2) Partially achieved (stabilization or increase in key endemic species)- bird surveys were conducted in 2008 and 2012 and showed that the population of key endemic and globally threatened bird species were mostly stable or increasing, with the exception of the Wallace's Standardwing (*Semioptera wallacii*). The populations of White Cockatoo (*Cacatua alba*) had already diminished by 80% from 1999 to 2008. The illegal trade in other protected species from the Park remains a significant continuing threat, with bird trapping issues the most frequently addressed by the ALNP management unit in 2011/2012.

(3) Not achieved (the METT score of 75)- the management effectiveness of ALNP was significantly enhanced during the project (the METT score increased considerably, from 15 to 64); however, the METT target set for the Aketajawe-Lolobata NP was not met. The target score of 75 could not be achieved due to limited progress in establishing effective field-level management, staff and infrastructure, due to limits in the Government budget and general difficulties in establishing additional Government service posts.

Both outcome indicators designed to measure the achievement of the project development objectives were not achieved according to the ICM. (1) No technical guidelines for collaborative management have been drawn up by the National Forestry Department. (2) There is no definite evidence that other protected areas have adopted, or plan to adopt, the project's collaborative approach. The expectation for the project was that the experiences of ALNP would be adopted in the Ministry of Forestry's technical policy, and be adopted in other National Parks and there is no indication that this occurred. However, multi-stakeholder partnerships have been recognized and promoted by the Department as one approach to collaborative natural resource management. Further, the lessons from the project have been shared with four other National Parks with similar management issues, and presented to the 2012 annual coordination meeting of all National Park management units and nature conservation offices.

When it comes to component - level indicators, the project was successful on most accounts (some were partially achieved and some with delays due largely to the time taken to establish the ALNP management unit). At the end of the project, the management unit was established, but significant shortcomings in the ground level capacity remained (e.g., in ground level patrolling). Bird trapping and trade remains a major threat.

The project started from a low base (with Aketajawe-Lolobata previously being the site of commercial logging, a recently designated national park that existed on 'paper' only with no management unit, no demarcated boundaries, no infrastructure and no central Government budget for the Park). Given this situation, the project was highly ambitious in the time that it had available. It aimed not only to establish working collaborative management agreements and to halt the environmental degradation of the Park, but also for the approach to be backed by a sufficient level of experience and confidence to form the basis of technical guidelines for the implementation of new laws on collaborative management and for its adoption in other protected areas in Indonesia.

4.3 Efficiency

Rating: **Satisfactory**

Most of the planned activities were completed, albeit with some delays due largely to the time taken to establish the ALNP management unit. There was little commitment to the establishment of the Park on the part of the original ALNP senior management at the beginning of the project, but this situation changed with a change of leadership of the management unit.

Looking at the GEF contribution in terms of dollar cost per unit of METT score increase achieved, the project helped the NP to increase the score from 15 to 64 for a total cost of \$3,126,413 of which the GEF and Burung Indonesia contributions were \$930,751.82 and \$261,517 respectively. This equals to \$63,800 per point increase, according to the ICM. Based on WWF's global analysis that tracks progress in protected areas management shows a mean total score of 50.4 for 94 Protected Areas in East Asia Pacific. Taking into account an increase of 49 points over 5 years, this project can be judged to have been highly effective in achieving this outcome, especially as management costs per hectare in EAP region have been generally in the range of around \$15/ha/year, whereas Aketajawe-Lolobata had to manage with some \$4.6/ha in 2012. However, data on average cost per unit of METT score increase have not been readily available.

The support to the National Park by way of higher than expected counterpart funding from the Central Government budget in the later years of the project enabled significant progress to be made in building management capacity, and therefore accelerated the process of concluding village resource management agreements and the operation of the multi-stakeholder forums. Whilst significant work was done on the background and baseline studies in the first two years of the project, the results of this work were only beginning to have effect in terms of the project's expected outcomes from 2011 onwards.

The selection of Burung Indonesia as executing agency meant that the specific experience in collaborative management and bird conservation of that organization could be mobilized quickly, and contributed greatly to the efficiency of implementation of the project. As Burung Indonesia Halmahera Programme has its offices in Ternate, they were able to monitor efficiently the progress of the activities on Halmahera island. The project team had satisfactory technical and administrative support from the head office staff. But, the actual counterpart co-financing from Burung Indonesia was less than anticipated. There were some cost savings on equipment and consultants, with a 10% increase in the costs of training, workshops and incremental operating costs over that originally budgeted. A change in the team leader in early 2012 resulted in a breakdown of previously commendable progress reporting.

The existence of the project and the capability of Burung Indonesia in Halmahera attracted support from other donors that were associated with the project's activities and objectives. The Loro Parque Fondation contributed EUR 150,000 to activities related to parrot conservation, and the ZGAP/Germany organization contributed almost EUR 30,000 to support activities to combat parrot trapping and trade, and awareness activities.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
--------------------	------------------------------------

Although the project managed to establish a good foundation for many activities, sustainability of project outcomes is rated as moderately unlikely given the environmental risks to the project. The ICM rated the overall risk to the development outcome as 'Moderate'. Environmental and institutional risks are the main types of risks to sustainability, and are outlined below.

Financial Resources - moderately likely – During the project, Central Government significantly increased allocations from its budget to ALNP, rising from approximately \$US 280,000 in 2009 to approximately \$US 880,000 in 2012. The ICM states that there is an effective management unit in place for ALNP, supported by significant central budget allocations, but does not provide further details of these funds. Burung Indonesia has committed \$US 40,000 for 2013 for post-project activities in Halmahera.

Environmental – moderately unlikely - The ICM rates environmental risks as 'high' as illegal mining and logging in the park continues. Bird populations remain at high risk with continuing illegal trapping and trade, and continuing efforts and successes in law enforcement will be crucial (note that there are still shortcomings in ground level patrolling). The threats frequently come from people from districts and provinces outside the Park and its surrounds.

Institutional framework and governance - moderately likely - Burung Indonesia's program in Halmahera will continue following the closure of the project with its activities concentrating on bird trapping and trade, the introduction of community-based wardens involving the Tobelo Dalam people, the development of a curriculum on conservation for local schools, and developing health and education programs for the Tobelo Dalam people. The multi-stakeholder forums will remain active as long as there is a budget to enable their work. There are discussions continuing on this point, but it is likely that they will be supported financially by the ALNP budget.

The management unit of ALNP is firmly established and, with the support of satisfactory levels of central government budget, can be expected to have a continuing and expanding role in the conservation and protection of the Park. The plans of ALNP to establish a ground level capability in patrolling and responding to illegal activities will greatly improve its overall effectiveness. There are also plans to develop the scientific and tourism potential of the Park. Nevertheless, significant shortcomings in the ground level capacity remain. A total of 40 staff work in the management unit, but the infrastructure for the section and resort-level offices, together with the estimated 90 field level staff, were not in place. Difficulties exist in creating new posts in the civil service, and recruitment is difficult due to the remote locations involved. This directly limits the ability of the management unit to work effectively and directly with locals. Further, although training was provided during the project, this should be a continuous activity and additional training will be required to achieve a working capacity within ALNP.

Socio-political – moderately likely - Multi-stakeholder forums have been established and are active. There is continually rising awareness on the part of the general public about the conservation of Indonesia's special forest resources and biodiversity. The ICM notes that increasing population pressures

will remain a cause of disagreement and conflict between communities and National Park authorities. The ICM was inclined to rate this risk as 'high', but due to efforts to implement mitigation measures involving communities in the boundary demarcation and village resource agreements, this risk was, in the end rated as moderate.

While six Village Nature Conservation Agreements were produced for six key villages surrounding the Park there remain several more key communities where agreements have yet to be prepared. Additionally, whilst there has been cooperation with companies (in particular PT Weda Bay Nickel) in the management of the Park, no specific agreements with companies/concession holders for collaborative management, as anticipated in the original project design, were concluded.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

At the outset, the project encountered an issue concerning the expected co-financing from corporate concession holders. According to government policy, government agencies cannot receive direct support from companies. At appraisal, there was a letter of agreement from PT Weda Bay Nickel to support the National Park, but this support could not be delivered. Dialogue with first the company and then its community development foundation (Saloi) and ALNP management continued throughout the project, but no resolution was found. Further, the actual counterpart co-financing from Burung Indonesia was also less than anticipated (no explanation provided in the ICM as to why this was so).

However, the government contributed higher-than anticipated levels of co-financing. There were significant increases in the Central Government Budget allocations to ALNP during the project, rising from approximately \$US 280,000 in 2009 to approximately \$US 880,000 in 2012. The support to the National Park by way of higher than expected counterpart funding from the Central Government budget in the later years of the project enabled significant progress to be made in building management capacity, and therefore accelerated the process of concluding village resource management agreements and the operation of the multi-stakeholder forums.

From 2007 to 2012, The Loro Parque Fundacion supported the activity related to the parrot conservation in the ALNP and the North Maluku Province. The ICM notes that during the five years of project implementation, the Loro Parque Fundacion gave EUR 150,000 as their commitment to support bird conservation. The ICM also notes that Burung Indonesia secured "support" from the ZGAP/Germany amounting to EUR 29,950 from 2007 to 2011 which was allocated to support parrot trapping and trading monitoring as well as awareness activities. It is not clear from the report if these funds were dedicated uniquely to the project or if they have been given to Burung Indonesia for its own activities (even though these are clearly related).

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project's closure date was extended. As stated in the ICM, "as the project was approaching its closure in May 2012, some key investigations had not been finalized concerning the social impacts on indigenous people and the zonation of the Aketajawe block, and some issues had arisen concerning illegal activities and boundary disputes. The project was in a good position to assist in these matters, and, with some undisbursed funds remaining, a request was made to the World Bank, and was granted, for a no cost extension for an additional 5 1/2 months until mid-December 2012." This delay does not appear to have affected project's outcomes.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

There were significant increases in the Central Government Budget allocations to ALNP during the project. Additionally, according to the ICM, it seems that there is commitment to the expansion of collaborative management by the Central Government. Government's contribution to the project positively affected outcomes and sustainability (as noted in section 5.1.).

On the other hand, coordination between the project and the Ministry of Forestry was weak and ineffective. The steering committee, established formally in 2008, met once in 2009, but it wasn't until the end of 2011 that it met again. The members of the committee changed twice during the project. The committee was to provide technical and policy guidance to the ALNP management unit, but would have also provided the opportunity for lessons from the project to have been promoted in the head office, and assisted in the promulgation and adoption of collaborative management which was the key development objective of the project. This aspect of the project was unsatisfactory.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Overall, the M&E design at entry was satisfactory, with the main shortcoming being the setting of unrealistic targets for achieving the project development and global environmental outcomes within the time specified and with such a low starting base.

Section six of the Project Document outlines the project’s Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. It notes that project monitoring will focus on issues of efficiency of use of project funds and staff, achievement of intermediate deadlines, as well as impact. Project monitoring was to include monitoring of indicators connected to replication and policy impact, and was to be the basis of accountability to donors and other stakeholders. Conversely, the national park management monitoring was to focus more on issues of practical concern. For efficiency and practicality these two programs of monitoring (project and environmental) were to be integrated. The Project Document had a detailed Log frame with (mostly) appropriate and relevant indicators. The ICM notes that one of those indicators was not relevant and the project development and global environmental outcomes were too ambitious. Arrangements for project evaluation (including timelines) were also specified. The budget for monitoring and evaluation activities is stipulated, and appears to be adequate.

The monitoring strategy outlines how biodiversity and threat monitoring was to have been carried out. The effectiveness of management of the National Park was to be subject to monitoring using the Management Effectiveness tracking tool. Initial assessments were already completed by the time the Project Document was prepared and they were to be repeated at the beginning of the project to provide a baseline, as well as throughout the project to measure progress. A more detailed monitoring plan, stipulating the exact data types and timelines, was to be developed at the start of the project and then revised at the end of year one based on the baselines established and indicators identified.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The project carried out a large number of monitoring and evaluation activities relevant to this national park. The main shortcoming is the fact that the Executing Agency was not submitting project progress reports on time and then not at all towards the end of the project.

Burung Indonesia established an operational field office for the project, established management systems, and prepared annual work plans and budgets in accordance with the activities as set out in the project document. Whilst financial reports were submitted on time, project progress reports were being submitted late and then not prepared at all during the second half of 2011 and 2012.

In terms of monitoring the environmental indicators, the project has provided updated information on biodiversity of the national park, illegal wildlife (bird) trade, landuse/forest cover changes in the national park and Halmahera Island, as well as the physical state of the national park boundaries. For the

monitoring of social indicators, the project has provided the latest distribution of Tobelo Dalam people to support the development of park's zoning system as well as information on the people's utilization patterns of the resources (although the GRM indicates that there were some issues with these data). Monitoring at community level has also been carried out to evaluate pilot initiatives in two villages (Woda and Woejerana), as well as developing monitoring framework of village nature conservation agreement (VNCA) implementation in six pilot villages

Information prepared by the project included land use and forest cover maps, results of avifauna surveys, results of assessments of boundary and resource management issues, and details of community awareness and perceptions. Using this information, a 20 - year plan for the strategic management of ALNP was produced in 2011, and was operationalized by a 5 - year management plan. The project also tracked the changes in management effectiveness through the METT score.

Training was a continuous activity of the project from 2009 onwards. Topics included GIS techniques, biodiversity survey methods, PRA, media and communications, participatory monitoring, and enumerator training for awareness surveys. Field and data analysis equipment was provided to the management unit of ALNP.

Project reports on baseline surveys and subsequent monitoring results were available for public access to all relevant stakeholders through the Burung Indonesia local office, and key technical reports were shared with the ALNP management unit.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The World Bank's overall performance is rated moderately satisfactory, mainly due to several shortcomings related to project design and early implementation.

According to the ICM, the World Bank supervision team Bank carried out annual technical field supervision missions throughout implementation, and provided "valuable guidance on implementation of the project, and on issues that arose". Some of those issues include incorporating safeguards concerning indigenous people and access restrictions into ALNP procedures. The World Bank team received support from financial management, procurement, social, environmental and safeguard

specialists to deal with these issues. There was a moderate degree of continuity in the task team, with the original Task Team Leader being replaced in 2010 by a task team leader who saw the project through to completion. All other aspects, according to the ICM, notably the relevance, technical design, implementation arrangements and monitoring and evaluation aspects, were satisfactory.

The main shortcoming includes the setting of overly ambitious targets for the replication of ALNP approach and lessons, and their incorporation into technical practice and policy at central Government level. Additionally, the choice of using an NGO, Burung Indonesia (although generally a good choice) always carried a risk, according to the ICM, that a “relatively small intervention implemented by a non-government organization would only have limited influence on management approaches in other protected areas, and on national forest management policy and general technical guidance.”

Other shortcomings include the issue concerning the co-financing of the project by commercial concession holders. Although the ICM calls this issue “minor”, the fact that it was the Indonesian Government’s policy that government agencies cannot receive direct support from companies should arguably have been foreseen at project design.

On safeguards issue, the responsibilities for implementation of safeguards both within the project, but also in the National Park itself, was given to Burung Indonesia, according to the Grant Agreement. This requirement was impossible for an NGO to comply with, as NGOs do not have the authority over the management of the National Park. As such, this can be considered to have been another design fault.

As stated in the ICM, the project’s achievements improved after 2010, but before that date the project had a “slow start and lack of project achievements.”

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---	--

The overall performance of the Executing Agency, Burung Indonesia, is rated moderately satisfactory, due to early project implementation issues and several other moderate shortcomings as outlined below.

The ICM notes that Burung Indonesia’s experience with international donor projects and support from its head office provided a satisfactory administrative base for the project and ensured high commitment to the objectives of the project. The operational field office was established and staffed without delay, which meant that the surveys and investigations on the physical and biodiversity status and threats could begin. Burung Indonesia also established management systems, and prepared annual work plans and budgets in accordance with the activities as set out in the project document. Burung Indonesia’s also fulfilled its responsibility to submit activity and financial/audit reports. There was consistent management of the project team with the one manager engaged from the outset, through the most difficult period of implementation up to 2012, and was replaced only as the project was nearing completion. Technical staff from Burung Indonesia’s head office and other project locations in Indonesia supported the project team.

Government had limited capacity at the start of the project in the ALNP area and the limited experience in collaborative management approaches. As such the ICM believes that it was appropriate to select Burung Indonesia, which is an NGO conservation organization with experience in both collaborative management and specific capability in bird conservation. Additionally, it was also appropriate, according to the ICM, to use Burung, a non-government facilitator, to reach agreement on boundary demarcation and resource use with the Government, communities and commercial interest around the park.

However, there were several notable shortcomings. Project performance was rated as moderately unsatisfactory in 2010 due to failure to deliver project outputs on time and for failure to follow the safeguards instruments requirements for a more detailed social assessment. Further, whilst financial reports were submitted on time, project progress reports were submitted with delays and not prepared at all during the second half of 2011 and 2012.

Lastly, coordination between the project and Ministry of Forestry through the steering committee was ineffective as the members of the steering committee changed twice over the course of the project and there were no steering committee meetings from 2009 until the end of 2011.

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

Collaborative management approaches involving multi-stakeholder forums and village resource agreements, backed up by extensive and continuing education and awareness efforts, provide a constructive and positive basis for dispute resolution, and for the necessary cooperation of communities in the conservation of their forest resources. This lowers the confrontational and adversarial aspects of issues involving different interests. But, multi-stakeholder forums require funds for continuing their coordination and problem solving roles, and the source of the budget for this needs to be contemplated in the project design.

Changing the attitudes and practice behavior of communities requires a continuing program of socialization and information. These programs should be designed to embed this capacity in government agencies so that the programs continue in the longer term, financed by government budgets. Similarly, the projects should strive to ensure that capacity building of government conservation agencies is viewed as a continuing process; that it is recognized by the agencies as such; and that provisions are made in their budgets to finance it.

A GEF intervention through an NGO can rapidly deploy resources to accelerate the protection of newly gazetted protected areas, whilst working in conjunction with the establishment of government agencies, which take time to be effective. A medium sized project will not have the resources to fully complete the process of capacity building for a newly formed government conservation agency, but can serve as an effective catalyst. For full-size projects it would be preferable to have the government implement the project, due to larger fund allocations requiring strong government buy-in.

Reliance on NGOs can also lead the government agencies to not pay enough attention to the implementation, if the project is not directly aligned within the agencies' priorities.

Dealing with challenges concerning the civil service, and the recruitment and training of field staff needs to be addressed in project design.

Donor projects, which set out to change government policy and practice, should be realistic as to the achievable extent of that change in the Indonesian context. Specifying this function in the responsibilities of steering committees, and monitoring performance, would assist in its achievement.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendations were combined with lessons learnt.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	A very clear and succinct presentation of evidence that objectively assesses both the achievements and shortcomings of the project.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	In general, the report is internally consistent and it presents clear and sufficient evidence to justify its ratings and assessments. However, in the table outlining the achievement of component - level outcomes, some outcomes have been listed as achieved, yet the evidence indicates that these either have not been achieved or were only partially achieved. For instance, on page 9, Component C " <i>Commitments of at least 110 000 USD per year secured for post-project funding</i> " was listed as achieved, but this rating was supported by evidence demonstrating that only USD 40,000 in post-project funding was secured from the Executing Agency. Based on this evidence, a partially achieved rating would be more appropriate. Several other ratings in this table have also been listed as achieved, when a partially achieved rating would have been more appropriate.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The ICM gives a comprehensive overview of sustainability, through a section outlining 'risks to development outcomes'. Risks along the technical, environmental, social, and governmental dimensions are specified. There are no shortcomings in this section.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report has a well - supported section on Lessons Learnt that is based on the evidence presented in the report. Recommendations were integrated in the Lessons Learnt section and are appropriate.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides the total actual project costs. All project costs are provided in one table, on page 1 of the report, that details the anticipated costs and the actual project costs per project funding source. Additionally, the table shows the original and actual costs per expenditure category. However, no project costs per activity are provided.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The ICM provides a good overview of the environmental and social monitoring activities performed by the project. It also provides an overview of some of the project - related monitoring. Some of this information is contained in the section outlining Executive Agency's performance. A more detailed section on the project's M&E systems would have been helpful.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S (5.3)

10. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources of information used.