

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 845		Review date: <u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$) ¹		09/08/2006
IA/EA Project ID:	PO 57123	GEF financing:	0.73	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	The Grater Berbak-Sembilang Integrated Coastal Wetland Conservation Project	IA/EA own:	0.26	0.03
Country:	Indonesia	Government:	0.61	0.03
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	0.87	0.06
Operational Program:	2 & 3	Total Project Cost:	1.60	0.76
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Wetlands international – Indonesia Programme (WI-IP)	Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		07/14/2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		08/25/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 08/31/2004	Actual: 08/31/2004
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 48 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 0 months
Author of TE:	-	TE completion date: 02/28/2005 (as reported by WB-EO)	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	S	-	-	S
2.2 Project	N/A	-	-	U

¹ Data from the project brief.

sustainability				
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	S	-	-	HS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	S

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. This TE presents all the necessary information in a very succinct yet comprehensive manner. The only shortcomings are the cursory assessments of the project finance (especially considering the dramatic decrease in budget from what was approved in the project brief and what was presented in the TE) and of the plan to monitor and evaluate the project implementation itself. Also absence of a list of acronyms and their explanations makes it difficult to understand project specific acronyms.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

To support an integrated conservation and development approach to the management of Berbak and Sembilang national parks and ensure public support necessary to maintain the Greater Berbak-Sembilang Ecosystem.

A review of the Project Brief shows that there were no changes during implementation.

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

According to the Project Brief, the proposed GEF project would promote conservation of an important forest and wetland ecosystem and address threats to the region's biodiversity in the following ways:

- Development of a Berbak-Sembilang Management Plan to establish new conservation areas.
- Integration of conservation plans within regional and provincial spatial development plans.
- Creation of a local constituency and capacity building for conservation, through an environmental awareness campaign aimed at all stakeholders to promote the conservation and wise use of natural resources in the Berbak-Sembilang ecosystem

The TE does not include a list of the project's development objectives, but makes no mention of any changes during implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The TE describes the following impacts of the project:

- Establishment of the Sembilang National Park (SNP) in South Sumatra Province (Ministry of Forestry Decree No.96, 19 March 2003).
- Preparation of a long-term management plan and operational plans for the Berbak National Park (BNP) and SNP.
- Increased awareness and support from policy makers and local communities regarding the conservation of SNP and BNP. For example the Governor of South Sumatra formed a Coordination Team to review development plans in the Sembilang coastal area.
- Preparation of an economic valuation model for SNP, which became one of the most important justifications for local governments to support SNP.
- Management of the SNP is now being handled by the BKSDA agency, which appointed

- 16 personnel for SNP.
- Declaration of an open forum called Forum Peduli Taman Nasional Sembilang which helped establish better partnerships with local NGOs.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes

A Relevance **Rating: HS**

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

Yes, this project’s outcomes are consistent with the focal area/ operational program strategy. The outcomes fall within two GEF operational programs:
 OP 2 Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems: The project promoted an ecosystem management approach for conservation of the Berbak and Sembilang coastal wetlands of Sumatra.
 OP 3 Forests: The project strengthened the protection and management of some of the most extensive and important remaining lowland swamp forests in Sumatra.

B Effectiveness **Rating: S**

- **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)?**

As described in the TE, the project was successful in achieving most of their expected outcomes. The main shortcoming was that a permanent management unit for SNP could not be established during the course of the project implementation.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: S**

- **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?**

The TE mentions a vast list of activities that were implemented. In addition, cost-effectiveness was increased by working in close collaboration with local NGOs and giving them the responsibility of implementing several of the planned activities.
 On the other part, changes of government officers and decision makers during project implementation decreased and halted the pace of progress. Also, the management of BNP underwent some obstacles related to conflicts between local villagers and BNP staff and as a result some project plans that were already on the process of being implemented had to be cancelled. Finally, the cost of transportation experienced during project implementation was higher than expected due to the remoteness of the area and lack of infrastructure.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

According to the TE, project activities have led to the following impacts:

- a detailed management framework and spatial plan for the Greater Berbak-Sembilang ecosystem based on biological/conservation value and socio economic realities. The management and operation plans for SNP and BNP were prepared and implemented by BKSDA.
- an expanded national park system to protect the whole Berbak-Sembilang ecosystem. The main impact being the establishment of the Sembilang National Park (SNP) in South Sumatra Province by the Government of Indonesia.

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.

A Financial resources **Rating: MU**

<p>The TE states described that during implementation BNP authority was unable to manage the park properly because of insufficient budget and human resources to overcome threats to biodiversity; and it made no mention of any improvement regarding this situation. According to the TE, the agency in charge of temporarily managing SNP has proposed to provide a specific budget for the Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation Department of Forestry (PHKA), but it is doubtful that it will be sufficient since during project implementation it encountered serious monetary constrains.</p>	
B Socio political	Rating: L
<p>The TE concludes that, in general, stakeholder involvement in the project was well planned and inclusive. Cooperation with local communities near BNP had improved by 2003 thanks to close cooperation with a local NGO (PINSE), but there is still a risk of conflict between local villagers and park rangers in that area if a more participatory approach is not followed.</p>	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: ML
<p>According to the TE, Indonesia's decentralization policy carries substantial risk of accelerating environmental degradation in the near future. Specifically, the creation of a new district (comprised in 20% by the SNP) signifies an important risk to the park since the district needs to generate its own revenue by utilizing local resources (including the forest resources in SNP). Also, local Government Agencies have different perceptions on protected areas and that can lead to contradictions in forest resource management.</p>	
D Environmental	Rating: ML
<p>The TE mentions that two floods (between December 2003 and March 2004) severely impacted the replanting area near BNP. This contingent events pose a threat to the recovery of rehabilitation of the park's burned areas. The project brief mentions that there is a strong pressure to open up the Berbak region to gas exploration, which could have serious consequences on the Berbak-Sembilang ecosystems; the TE doesn't address this issue.</p>	

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

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

4.3 Catalytic role

<p>1. Production of a public good</p> <p>The TE describes that in order to increase awareness of local communities on conservation, the project produced and disseminated a number of conservation awareness materials, including posters, leaflets, environmental education materials fro school children, a documentary film, etc.</p>
<p>2. Demonstration</p> <p>According to the TE, the project provided training and support to the monitoring survey team (including forest rangers, local NGOs and villagers) on wildlife and monitoring survey techniques to keep the evaluation of the parks going after the project ends.</p>
<p>3. Replication</p> <p>The TE points out that the project focused its efforts to put conservation of Berbak-Sembilang on the local government's agenda, so that conservation activities could be conducted not only by the project but also by government agencies and could therefore be easily replicated. As an example, coordination efforts among stakeholders were replicated by other state agencies such as the local agency of Culture and Tourism, and of Forestry. Most importantly, as a result of the project, the Forum Peduli Sembilang was created and replication of major project activities was explicitly stated in its objectives and strategic action plan.</p>
<p>4. Scaling up</p>

-

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

A. In retrospection, was the M&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&E activities)	Rating: S
The project brief explains that monitoring the condition of Berbak and Sembilang was not only to be based on monitoring surveys to be carried out 3 times a year, but the effort was also to be aided by other field activities (e.g. regular patrolling by local agencies, findings from village meetings, etc.) and secondary information from newspapers articles, university thesis, reports, etc. The TE explains that given the vastness of the area and the limited time, funds and personnel, a landscape approach was chosen to monitor the condition of Berbak-Sembilang. At the same time it recognizes that the findings of rapid monitoring surveys of such large scale should not always be considered determinant factors when planning smaller scale activities.	
B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&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&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?	Rating: HS
According to the TE, the M&E system operated throughout the project, and, because the evaluation of project performance involved project counterparts and partners, it was easy to discuss priorities and refocus project activities during implementation. It also mentions that the project did an outstanding job at providing training for parties responsible for the M&E activities, as shown by the creation of the Integrated Monitoring Unit consisting of park rangers and local people/NGO staff.	
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?	Rating: S
The TE makes no mention of shortage of funding during implementation.	
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? Yes. This M&E system was very much geared at improving the capacities of all interested stakeholders so that M&E activities could be continued once the project finished. It also made good use of existing available information and had close cooperation with government agencies.	

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

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?
The TE includes a long list of lessons, but only the following could have application for other GEF projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need to involve local government more directly in activities aimed at restricting adverse land use and implementation of development schemes• Thorough research on economic and biodiversity values served by a national park is one important tool to raise awareness and policy support from local government especially following the policy of decentralization.• Structural changes and changes of senior officers in park authority and local government agencies have influence on project progress. In order to overcome this problem, the project appointed staff as counterparts in order to maintain the coordination and communication that had been set up.• Monitoring surveys jointly conducted by park rangers, local NGOs and local community

not only give rise to survey findings on biodiversity and current threats, but also facilitates close coordination between the stakeholders.

- Replicability of project activities (such as monitoring efforts, environmental education, community development and other supporting activities) can be managed more effectively by local NGOs. This is mainly because of less bureaucratic procedures, but also because they have a strong and long-term commitment to the area.

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.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
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.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Yes. It provides clear information of the project implementation, achievements and failures. It also gives a comprehensible assessment of the political/social situation in Indonesia and the possible influences that can have on the expected project impacts.	S (5)
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? The report is consistent but fails to present any ratings.	S (5)
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes. The TE covers this issue throughout the document, it describes all the actions taken in order to make the project replicable, assesses stakeholder participation, identifies possible risks regarding Indonesia’s political and governmental situation, and includes information on the agreed exit strategy to maintain conservation efforts in the Berbak-Sembilang area.	S (5)
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Yes. Although the TE includes a long list of lessons learned, many of them are really just a summary of results.	MS (4)
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes. The TE does not provide any explanations about changes between planned and actual expenditure (there is a considerable difference between the planned budget in the project brief and the one presented in the TE)	MS (4)
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes. It gives a complete assessment of the M&E of the interaction between people and the national parks but is vague when addressing the M&E of project implementation itself.	MS (4)

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in	Yes: X	No:
---	---------------	------------

the appropriate box and explain below.

Explain: Yes. It would be important to follow up on issues such as the formation of a managing authority for the SNP and the allocation of necessary funds to ensure sustainable management of both SNP and BNP. These issues are essential to guarantee that the protected areas have a positive impact on the conservation of biodiversity (and don't end up being just "paper parks").	

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

Project brief, PIR 2004
