**Assignment:** TF090560

**GEF MSP - INDONESIA: GRANT FOR PARTNERSHIPS FOR CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT OF THE AKETEJAWE-LOLOBATA NATIONAL PARK, NORTH MALUKU PROVINCE**

**GEFIA - GEF-IBRD AS IMPLEMENTING AGENCY**

Task Team Leader: 00000348287 - Juha Antti Kalevi Seppala

Approving Manager: 00000208109 - Nathan M. Belete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF Status</td>
<td>LCLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Country</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executed By</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Unit</td>
<td>8097 - EASIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Start Date / End Date</td>
<td>07/23/2007 to 06/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>Karin Shepardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Grant Amount</td>
<td>999,954.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Amount</td>
<td>930,751.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Commitments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Disbursements</td>
<td>930,751.82 as of 06/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursed 07/23/2007 to 06/30/2013</td>
<td>930,751.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>TF602001 - MULTIPLE DONORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This GRM report includes the following sections: Overview, Outcome, Components/Outputs, Execution, Program(GEFIA), Completion, Processing, Attached Documents, Disbursements.*
OVERVIEW

Overall Assessments and Ratings

Grant Objectives:
The objective of the Project is to improve the management and sustainability of Halmahera’s forest resources through strengthened protection and management of the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park (“ALNP”)

Overall progress from 07/23/2007 to 06/30/2013 with regard to Achieving Grant Objectives:
Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Comment:
The project was ultimately unsuccessful in achieving its ultimate PDO and GEO indicators - no technical guidelines for collaborative management have been drawn up by the Ministry of Forestry; no definite evidence that other protected areas have adopted, or plan to adopt, the project’s collaborative approach; the METT score target set for the Aketajawe-Lolobata NP was not met (though increased dramatically from 15 to 64, just short of target of 75) and halting of deforestation remains unclear for the Aketajawe block (though now much lower).

On component level indicators, the project was, however, successful on most accounts. The project successfully strengthened the management capacity of the ALNP and introduced collaborative management mechanisms involving the main relevant Government and community stakeholders in the Aketajawe-Lolobata region. At the start of the project, ALNP was recently designated, and there was no management unit in place. In fact, it was not until 2011 that the management unit was established and therefore only two years of project support to the unit and the collaborative management organizations and mechanisms were able to be provided. At the end of the project, the management unit was established, but significant shortcomings in the ground level capacity remained. 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 local communities, and to patrol, monitor and react to threats to the Park at a local level.

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.

The project conducted public awareness and education programs directed at local communities surrounding the Park, and to key civil society organization and the general public in Halmahera and North Maluku. To gauge the impacts of these programs, #Knowledge, Attitude and Practice# surveys were conducted during the project. A comparison of survey results from 2008 and 2012 show that whilst awareness of conservation issues, the role of the National Park and bird species increased, only limited success was achieved in changing practice behavior. The proportion of respondents who would not cut trees or trap birds in the National Park remained basically constant at approximately 30% and 65% respectively. Bird trapping and trade remains a major threat.

The project did support the dissemination of information on the design and experiences of the collaborative management approach at ALNP to other protected area management units, and provided the National Forestry Department (Ministry of Forestry) with policy/information briefs on this approach. The outcome of the project’s component E to replicate the ALNP approach was satisfactory, but the acceptance and uptake by Central Government and other national park management units did not eventuate as expected. No technical guidelines for the replication of this approach to other protected areas were prepared, and the impact of the project on designing collaborative management systems in other protected areas in Indonesia remained limited. The experience so far may have been valuable in contributing to the continuing enhancement of management effectiveness in other protected areas in Indonesia (no evidence is available to support this), but the duration of the project was far too short for ALNP to have developed stable and refined management systems, and gained the experience
necessary, for ALNP to be proved as a model for collaborative management in a broader context. Therefore, the project#s broader development objective of strengthening the enabling framework in Indonesia as measured by the project#s indicators is considered to have been only partly achieved.

The global environmental objective has also only been partially achieved, and the results mixed. Forest degradation has been reversed in the Lolobata block, but continues in the Aketajawe block. Key bird populations have stabilized, but the White Cockatoo population is under greater risk than previously due to its unclear protection status resulting in an 80% decline from 1999 to start of project. During the project, Wallace's Standardwing has slightly declined. In addition, whilst the management effectiveness of ALNP has significantly been enhanced during the project, the tracking tool score did not achieve its target, mainly due to limitations on the Government side in creating the infrastructure and filling the jobs required for effective ground level operations.

**Overall progress from 07/23/2007 to 06/30/2013 with regard to Implementation of Grant Financed Activities:**

*Rating:* Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

*Comment:* 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. The disconnect between the project-level indicators, however, led to a reduced impact at the PDO and GEO level, even though the implementation of the grant was moderately satisfactory.

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. In effect, whilst significant work was done on the background and baseline studies in the first two years of the project, the results of this work only were beginning to have effect in terms of the project#s expected outcomes from 2011 onwards.

The selection of Burung Indonesia as beneficiary to implement the project 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 could monitor efficiently the progress of the activities on Halmahera island. The project team had satisfactory technical and administrative support from the head office staff and the actual counterpart co-financing from Burung Indonesia was less than anticipated. There were also 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. 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. A global analysis tracking progress in managing protected areas around the world by WWF of 94 Protected Areas in East Asia Pacific resulted in a mean total score of 50.4. Taking into account an increase of 49 points over 5 years, the 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 has 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 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 Fondacion 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.

**Grant follow-up and structure**

*Description and context of Grant:*
Expected follow up (if any):

Comment on follow up:

End Date of Last Site Visit:

Restructuring of Grant:
The project closing date was extended on May 23, 2012 to December 15, 2012 to allow for the project to help operationalize the Multistakeholder Forums, among others.

Activity Risk
Rating: Modest Risk
Comment:
The overall risk to the development outcome is rated as Moderate based on the following assessments:

Technical - low: The approach implemented in ALNP represented a further step in the evolution of stakeholder participation in resource management. For ALNP itself, the collaborative management structures and practices have stabilized and the results are positive. The project has and will continue to provide lessons on collaborative management, but the extent to which these will be adopted in other areas is uncertain. It is likely that the details of the structures and operations of the various components of the ALNP collaborative management strategy would need to be modified to suit specific circumstances in other areas depending on the resources, threats, social circumstances and management capacity.

Social # moderate: Increasing population pressures will always result in people seeking resources for their livelihoods and can be expected to remain a cause of disagreement and conflict between communities and National Park authorities. This risk would be rated as high, but through the implementation of mitigation measures involving communities in the boundary demarcation and village resource agreements, this risk is rated as moderate.

Environmental # high: Illegal mining and logging continues. Bird populations remain at high risk with continuing illegal trade, and efforts and successes in law enforcement will be crucial. The threats frequently come from people from districts and provinces outside the Park and its surrounds.

Government Commitment - moderate: Future increases in management effectiveness at ALNP will depend on further investment by the central government to establish the field level infrastructure and equipment for the protection of the Park, and the ability of the management unit to successfully create the civil service posts for the ground level staff. Recruitment to fill these posts will be difficult, and the delivery of continuing technical training to Park staff will be needed. On the other hand, there is an effective management unit in place for ALNP, supported by significant central budget allocations. From the standpoint of Central Government, there is commitment to the expansion of collaborative management, and the project results will certainly contribute to the expanding knowledge and formulation of good/best practices. However, there are many factors that influence Government policy and the implementation of management change in protected areas.

Other stakeholders# commitment# low: Multi-stakeholder forums have been established and are active. There is continually rising awareness on the part of the general public to the conservation of Indonesia#s special forest resources and biodiversity. Burung Indonesia#s continuing presence in Halmahera will support the ALNP management unit by continuing its activities in bird research and monitoring, education and awareness. Ground level protection should be enhanced through Burung Indonesia#s plan to use community members as wardens.

Critical Issues and Pending Actions for Management Attention
There are currently no issues and actions for Management attention.
OUTCOME

Comments on outcome achieved from 07/23/2007 to 06/30/2013

Grant Outcome Indicators

Grant outcome indicators are listed below.

Policy makers issue technical guidelines for implementation of law on Collaborative Mgt using project lessons & examples from use of project model in other NP

Baseline Value: Absent

Date: 01/01/2008

Progress to Date: No technical guidelines for collaborative management have been drawn up by the National Forestry Department. However, multi-stakeholder partnerships have been recognised and promoted by the Department as one approach to collaborative natural resource mgmt.

Date: 06/30/2013

Target Value: Present

Date: 12/31/2010

At least 2 other protected areas in Indonesia plan to adopt the project approach on the basis of lessons learned from Aketajawe-Lolobata

Baseline Value: 0

Date: 01/01/2008

Progress to Date: No evidence that other PAs have adopted, or plan to adopt, the project’s collaborative approach, but lessons from the project have been shared with 4 NPs with similar mgmt issues, and presented to the 2012 annual coord mtng of NPs and BKSDAs.

Date: 06/30/2013

Target Value: 2 or more

Date: 12/15/2012

Forest degradation and loss caused by commercial logging operations within the National Park is halted by the end of project.

Baseline Value: Present

Date: 01/01/2008

Progress to Date: 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.

Date: 06/30/2013

Target Value: Absent

Date: 12/15/2012
Management effectiveness tracking tool score for ALNP improves from baseline of 15 to at least 75 by the end of the project.

Baseline Value: 15
Date: 12/23/2005
Progress to Date: 64
Date: 06/30/2013
Target Value: 75 or more
Date: 12/15/2012

Stability or increase in the population of key endemic and globally threatened key species within ALNP.

Baseline Value: (to be established)
Date: 
Progress to Date: Stability/increase. Bird surveys undertaken in 2008 and 2012 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.
Date: 06/30/2013
Target Value: stability/increase
Date: 12/15/2012

Information available on physical state of boundaries and habitats, current level of exploitation, and perceptions and priorities of all key stakeholders, by end of year 1.

Baseline Value: Absent
Date: 01/01/2008
Progress to Date: Present. 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, distribution and social issues of the Tobelo Dalam IPs
Date: 06/30/2013
Target Value: Present
Date: 12/15/2012

5-year operational plan document agreed between project and national park team by 1st quarter year 2.

Baseline Value: Absent
Date: 01/01/2008
Progress to Date: Present. 20-year and 5-year National Park Management Plan (RPTN) approved. The management unit produces an annual plan of work and budget as required for all Government agencies based on these longer-term plans.
Date: 06/30/2013
Target Value: Present
Date: 03/31/2009
Agreements between ALNP and all key communities, concessions holders are signed by the end of year 2.

**Baseline Value:** 0 agreements

**Progress to Date:** Six Village Nature Conservation Agreements were produced for six key villages surrounding the Park. Five of the six were signed and operational by the end of the project.

**Target Value:** agreements with all key communities and concessions holders

**Date:** 12/15/2012

ALNP boundaries are fully demarcated on the ground by the end of year 3.

**Baseline Value:** 38% of boundaries demarcated

**Progress to Date:** Demarcation for Lolobata and Aketajawe was completed in 2008 and 2012 respectively. There remains some issues to be resolved concerning the existence and placement of some of the boundary markers with the Government Forest Boundaries Agency (BPKH)

**Target Value:** 100% of boundaries demarcated

**Date:** 12/31/2010

Agreed priority training and materials delivered

**Baseline Value:** 0 training and materials delivered

**Progress to Date:** Training was a continuous activity of the project from 2009 onwards. Study visits were undertaken to four other National Parks. Field and data analysis equipment was provided to the management unit of ALNP.

**Target Value:** agreed (to be determined) priority training and materials delivered

**Date:** 12/15/2012

Commitments of at least 110,000 USD per year secured for post-project funding.

**Baseline Value:** 0 USD

**Progress to Date:** There were significant increases in Central Government Budget allocations to ALNP during the project, rising from approximately US$ 280,000 in 2009 to approximately US$880,000 in 2012. Burung Indonesia has committed US$40k for 2013.

**Target Value:** 550,000 USD secured for post-project funding

**Date:** 12/15/2012
All relevant stakeholders have access to baseline data and monitoring results for key social and environmental indicators.

Baseline Value: 0% of relevant stakeholders have access to these baseline data and results.

Progress to Date: 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.

Target Value: 100% of relevant stakeholders have access to these baseline data and results.

Project policy papers and notes on dialogue with policy makers showing link to achievement of defined policy objectives by end of project.

Baseline Value: 0 project policy papers and notes

Progress to Date: The project prepared two policy briefs and three technical guideline papers on matters ranging from parrot trapping and trade, to collaborative management in National Parks.

Target Value: 2 or more project policy papers and notes

Project consulted on proposals to establish collaborative management processes and institutions in at least two other national parks by end of project.

Baseline Value: 0 NP consulted project

Progress to Date: The project facilitated study visits to four other National Parks and, whilst these initially were learning visits for ALNP staff, they did lead to some degree of communication and exchange of the experiences of the project.

Target Value: 2 or more NP consulted project

NP and District Government annual plans and budgets are changed to accommodate priority issues in support of the NP.

Baseline Value: Annual plans and budgets are not changed.

Progress to Date: Whilst some of the priority issues of the ALNP were accommodated and included into district government annuals plans and budgets, it is difficult to measure any direct resulting impact.

Target Value: Annual plans and budged are changed.

Date: 12/15/2012
Project plans, budgets, reports are submitted on time, adjusted to incorporate the results of M and E and external factors, years 1-5

Baseline Value: not applicable

Whilst financial reports were submitted on time, project progress reports were usually provided with significant delays and not prepared at all during the second half of 2011 and 2012.

Target Value: plans, budgets and reports submitted on time and adjusted to incorporate M and E results and external factors

COMPONENTS/OUTPUTS

Output and Implementation by Component
Defining the Scope for Management of ALNP

Implementation Rating: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Status: Completed
Planned Output:
1) Satellite images & official maps analyzed
2) Resource mgmt & forest boundary issues assessed
3) Map & study forest Tobelo resource use
4) Biodiv. & wildlife trade baseline
5) NP zonation & mgt operational plan

Actual Output:
1) OK
2) OK
3) OK
4) OK
5) 5 yr mgmt plans approved, zonation for Lolobata Block OK, draft zonation for Aketajawe block.

Establishing a Collaborative Management Regime

Implementation Rating: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Status: Completed
Planned Output:
1) Agreement with concession holders & between NP, gov & communities
2) Demarcate boundary
3) Logging & resource extraction stabilizing initiatives
4) Multistakeholder forum (MSF) evaluate its effectiveness; etc

Actual Output:
1) Not achieved
2) Boundaries demarcated, Lolobata official, Aketajawe block boundary not yet legalized
3) Pilots carried out in 2 villages
4) All 3 MSFs established

Building Capacity for Protected Areas Management

Implementation Rating: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Status: Completed
Planned Output:
1) Material, equipment & information provided to NP mgmt unit; support from gov & priv. sector monitored
2) On-job training & study visits to strengthen NP mgmt unit
3) Student training (awareness survey), etc.

Actual Output:
1) Field equipment and computer systems provided to mgmt unit
2) Various trainings on management and biodiversity monitoring and GIS, study visits to 4 NPs
3) Completed.
**Monitoring and Evaluation to Support Adaptive Management**

**Implementation**

Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

**Rating:**

Moderately Satisfactory

**Status:**

Completed

**Planned Output:**

1) Visits & info gathered to monitor agreements & concessions; 2) Joint impl. 3) Land use & forest coverchg; 4) Indicators of project impact on Tobelos; 5) biodiversity status indicators (wild & in trade)

**Actual Output:**

1) No agreements were signed; 2) Completed; 3) Completed; 4) Monitoring being done via MSFs; 5) BD baseline completed in 2008 and follow-up in 2012

---

**Replication of the Project Model to other Sites**

**Implementation**

Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

**Rating:**

Satisfactory

**Status:**

Completed

**Planned Output:**

1) Info exchanged with other NPs & PAs; 2) Exch. learning visits from other cons. sites; 3) Disseminate policy-relevant lessons to decision makers; 4) Produce guidelines for cons. managers & decision makers; etc.

**Actual Output:**

1) Info exchange with 4 NPs; 2) Done to several NPs in Indonesia; 3) Policy briefs done on parrot trade and bird diversity; 4) Guidelines produced on IPs in NP; zoning and boundary conflict resolution

---

**Raising Awareness and Public Support**

**Implementation**

Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Unsatisfactory on 06/30/2012)

**Rating:**

Satisfactory

**Status:**

Completed

**Planned Output:**

1) Baseline attitude & awareness survey; repeat survey; 2) Evaluate NP environmental services & goods to show value; 3) Design, test & produce awareness materials; 4) Promote the project & NP to public, etc.

**Actual Output:**

1) Baseline survey completed; 2) Report done; 3) Done, various materials produced; 4) Carried out

---

**Effective Project Management Systems Established**

**Implementation**

Moderately Unsatisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Unsatisfactory on 06/30/2012)

**Rating:**

Moderately Unsatisfactory

**Status:**

Completed

**Planned Output:**

1) Staff & consultants recruited; 2) Joint field office established with NP; 3) Workplan & budget prepared; 4) Project monitoring & reporting in place; 5) Project Steering Committee established & meets regularly, etc.

**Actual Output:**

1) OK; 2) No joint office; 3) Workplan prepared; 4) Proj reports submitted late; 5) Steering Committee has been re-established and met twice in FY12.

---

**The enabling framework for collaborative mgmt of PA areas is strengthened through promotion and replication of the ALNP approach**

**Implementation**

Moderately Unsatisfactory

**Rating:**

Moderately Unsatisfactory

**Status:**

Completed

**Planned Output:**

1) Natl Forestry Dept issue technical guidelines for implementation of the law on Collaborative Mgmt; 2) 2 other PAs plan to adopt project’s approach based on lessons learned

**Actual Output:**

1) No tech guidelines for collaborative mgmt have been drawn up by the Natl. Forestry Dept.; 2) no evidence that other PAs have adopted the project’s collaborative approach
Globally significant biodiv of Aketajawe Lolobata NP is conserved through an effective conservation mgmt regime

Implementation Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
Status: Completed
Planned Output:
1) Forest deg and loss caused by commercial logging operations within the NP is halted by the end of project;
2) METT score improves from 15 to 75;
3) Stability or increase in the pop of key species

Actual Output:
1) Forest deg halted and reversed in the Lolobata block, not in Aketajawe block;
2) METT score 64;
3) Mostly stable or increasing

Comment on planned and actual Output

Comment on component implementation progress
Last two grant components provided are the PDO and GEO to better explain the reasoning behind the overall progress rating.

EXECUTION

Bank project related to the grant

Project ID / Name: P098308 - ID-GM-Conservation of Aketajawe-Lolobata
Project Status: Lending
Global Focal Area: Biodiversity
Product Line: GM - GEF Medium Sized Program

Implementing agency and contact details

Agency: Burung Indonesia
Contact: Sukianto Lusli /Agus Utomo
Address: Jl. Dadali 32 Bogor, P.O. Box 310/Boo, Bogor 16003, Indonesia
Phone: +62251357222 ext.104
Email:
Website:

Implementation performance ratings from 07/23/2007 to 06/30/2013 with regard to:

Project Management: Unsatisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Unsatisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Brief Comment:
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. Final report provided. Delays in completing key outputs.

Financial Management: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Brief Comment:
FM rating has remained satisfactory throughout the project.
Counterpart Funding: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
Central Government Budget allocations to ALNP rose during the project from approx. US$ 280,000 in 2009 to approx. US$ 880,000 in 2012. For post-project activities in Halmahera, Burung Indonesia has committed US$40,000 for 2013.

Procurement: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
Procurement rating has remained satisfactory throughout the project.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
There were lapses and delays in data gathering of project and NP impact to Forest Tobelo IPs and these were only completed towards the end of the project. Guidelines produced in last year of project. Multi-Stakeholder Forums have taken over some monitorin

Additional Comments on Implementation Performance:

PROGRAM

Program Specific Ratings

1. Please rate public involvement - Not Rated
2. Please rate government commitment - Moderately Unsatisfactory
3. Please rate safeguard performance - Moderately Satisfactory
4. Please rate arrangements for sustainability - Moderately Satisfactory

Program Specific Questions

1. Please comment on additional resources leveraged
From 2007 to 2012, The Loro Parque Fundacion supported the activity related to the parrot conservation in the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park especially and the North Maluku Province in general. During the five years project implementation, the Loro Parque Fundacion funded EUR 150,000 as their commitment to support bird conservation in the North Maluku. Burung Indonesia secured support from the ZGAP/Germany amounting EUR 29,950 from 2007 # 2011 allocated to support parrot trapping and trading monitoring as well as awareness activities.
The Aketajawe Lolobata National Park allocated budget amounting IDR 21,098,440,000 (US$ 1.85 M) during the project period to support activities especially for organisational, protection, utilisation, and preservation. Central Government Budget allocations to ALNP during the project, rising from approximately US$ 280,000 in 2009 to approximately US$ 880,000 in 2012. For post-project activities in Halmahera, Burung Indonesia has committed US$ 40,000 for 2013.
Overall Assessments and Lessons Learned

Main lessons learned:

## 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.

## Changing the attitudes and practice behaviour of communities requires a continuing program of socialization and information. Short term interventions can establish curriculums and programs and make the investments in training capacity, but should also be designed to embed this capacity in government agencies so that the programs continue in the longer term, financed by government budgets. Indicators for awareness/education components should measure change, but also should gauge their achievements by the commitment of government to continue the activities after the intervention is complete.

## Similarly for building the capacity of government conservation agencies, this is a continuing process, as is staff development in any organization. Short term interventions correctly should provide initial training, but also should strive to ensure that agencies recognise the crucial importance of ongoing staff training, and make provisions in their budgets to finance it. Achievement indicators should reflect this.

## 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.

## A GEF intervention through an NGO can rapidly deploy resources and staff to accelerate the protection of newly gazetted protected areas, whilst working in conjunction with the establishment of government agencies which tend to take time to be effective. A medium sized grant project will not have the resources required to fully complete the process of building the capacity of a newly former government conservation agency but can serve as an effective catalyst.

## Having an NGO implement the project on behalf of the Government has been the norm in Indonesia for GEF medium-size biodiversity projects for some time. In the case of this project, the NGO was able to start the work swiftly and fill-in the void caused by thin government resources available at the start of the project without completely overtaking the client's responsibilities. For full-size projects it would be preferable to have the government implement due to larger fund allocations requiring strong government buy-in.

## It is also evident, that reliance on NGOs can also lead the client (Ministry of Forestry in this case) to not pay enough attention in the implementation, if the project is not directly within the client's priorities. Not having a steering committee in place for almost three years at the MoFor implies the low buy-in of the client to this project.

## On safeguards issues, the NGO was, according to the Grant Agreement, responsible for implementation of safeguards within the project but also in the National Park itself. This requirement is impossible for an NGO to comply with: the NGO does not have the authority over the management of the NP. Thus in future Grants, if an NGO is implementing, the government should be required to shoulder the responsibility over safeguards pertaining to the NP itself, while the implementing NGO would be responsible for the project's adherence to safeguards instruments.

## Insufficient attention is paid to establishing effective ground-level capacity in protected areas. National parks frequently have fully staffed and budgeted head offices, but insufficient capacity in responding to local conflicts, to local infringements on resource use and encroachment, and in providing monitoring information to enable management plans to adapt to changing threats. 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.

Overall outcome (and its Sustainability): Rated Uncertain

Comment:

The overall outcome for the project is considered to be #Moderately Unsatisfactory#. Whilst most of the project outcomes were achieved, these, in turn, did not result in the main development and environmental objectives being achieved in full. The development objective of the project was more than the establishment of collaborative management in ALNP - it was the promotion and replication of the ALNP approach. The expectation was that the experiences of ALNP would be adopted in the Ministry of Forestry's technical policy, and be adopted in other National Parks. Progress was made during the project towards
these goals, and it is possible that the development objective may be achieved over time. The establishment of the collaborative management approach and capacity in ALNP to secure the Park and protect its resources was satisfactory given the starting point and the time involved, although there are still shortcomings in ground level patrolling and the continuing threat of bird trapping.

**Bank Performance: Rated Satisfactory**

**Comment:**
Quality at entry was satisfactory with the main shortcoming being the setting of overly ambitious targets for the replication of ALNP approach and lessons, and incorporation into technical practice and policy at central Government level. Other shortcomings, such as the issue concerning the co-financing of the project by commercial concession holders, were minor. All other aspects, notably the relevance, technical design, implementation arrangements and monitoring and evaluation aspects, were satisfactory.

The overall performance of the World Bank supervision team is rated Satisfactory. Bank staff carried out annual technical field supervision missions throughout implementation, and provided valuable guidance on implementation of the project, and on issues that arose. The Bank provided guidance in incorporating safeguards concerning indigenous people and access restrictions into ALNP procedures. There was a moderate degree of continuity in the task team, with the original Task Team Leader being replaced in 2010 by a TTL who saw the project through to completion. The task team received support from financial management, procurement, social, environmental and safeguard specialists. The quality and impact of supervision activities, particularly during the second half of implementation after a slow start and lack of project achievement before 2010, was highly satisfactory.

**Additional Assessment**

**Development / strengthening of institutions: Rated Modest**

**Comment:**
The project has strengthened the management capacity of the Aketajawe-Lolobata National Park (ALNP) Management Unit. The process for developing the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park’s long-term management plan for 2010 # 2029 was started in 2009. The plan provides guidance and direction for the national park authorities. This was developed to improve the 25-year management plan of Aketajawe Lolobata National Park previously formulated by the Maluku Nature Conservation Agency and the University of Pattimura in Ambon. At that time the management unit of the ALNP had not been established. The development of a 20-year management plan involved cooperation among provincial government agencies, universities, NGOs, and the ALNP team to complete the document. Updated data and information used in developing the management plan were from the results of studies and surveys carried out by the national park management unit and Project Team (Burung Indonesia), draft of the provincial and district spatial and land use planning reports. For the implementation, a five-year plan was prepared following the 20-year management plan and based on the priority and sequence of activities. The managerial aspects of the management plan are an attempt to achieve: stability of the ALNP areas, empowerment of the ALNP organisation, conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems, as well as the development of environmental services and community based ecotourism.

The 20-year management plan for the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park was endorsed by the Provincial Development Planning Agency in August 2010 and legalised by the DG of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation on 26 January 2011. As part of developing the management plan, the process of defining zonation system in the Lolobata block of the ALNP was carried out in 2010 by the ALNP with support from independent consultants and consultations with key stakeholders. The data and information collected from the project has been used to define the zonation inside the Lolobata block. Even though the zonation has been finalised, the document has not yet been legalised by the Ministry of Forestry. To support the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park management unit in delivering the park’s duties to the stakeholders, the government in Halmahera Island and priority materials and equipment provided during the project period.

In 2011, field equipments were handed over to the national park management unit to support the implementation of field activities. The following year, in 2012, a computer and an up-to-date GIS software package were provided to the park authority to support the national park technical staff to deliver high quality mapping and spatial analysis work relating to the park’s zonation and boundary management.
Mobilization of other resources: Rated Modest

Comment:
From 2007 to 2012, The Loro Parque Fundacion supported the activity related to the parrot conservation in the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park especially and the North Maluku Province in general. During the five years project implementation, the Loro Parque Fundacion funded EUR 150,000 as their commitment to support bird conservation in the North Maluku. Burung Indonesia secured support from the ZGAP/Germany amounting EUR 29,950 from 2007 # 2011 allocated to support parrot trapping and trading monitoring as well as awareness activities.

The Aketajawe Lolobata National Park allocated budget amounting IDR 21,098,440,000 (US$ 1.85 M) during the project period to support activities especially for organisational, protection, utilisation, and preservation. Central Government Budget allocations to ALNP during the project, rising from approximately US$ 280,000 in 2009 to approximately US$ 880,000 in 2012.

For post-project activities in Halmahera, Burung Indonesia has committed US$ 40,000 for 2013.

Knowledge exchange : Rated Modest

Comment:
The Project has facilitated learning process and sharing experiences on national park management for the national park management team and key stakeholders. The ALNP management team, key local government staffs, and heads of multi-stakeholder forums participated in a number of study visits to other national parks that have similarities in terms of management issues and challenges. The national parks visited were:
- Gunung Halimun Salak National Park in 2009 to learn about partnership management models;
- Lore Lindu National Park in 2010 to study on building partnerships with local government;
- Bukit Duabelas National Park in 2012 to study building partnerships with local stakeholders in managing national parks;
- Kutai National Park in 2012 to learn about collaborative management model.

Client’s policy / program implementation : Rated Modest

Comment:
Burung Indonesia encouraged the Ministry of Forestry to form a Steering Committee to direct the GEF Halmahera project. In 2008, a Steering Committee was established based on a Director General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation Decree No. SK.110/IV-KK/2008 on the Coordination Team of Partnership Programme for Conservation Management of Aketajawe Lolobata National Park. The decree is described in Annex 51.

The Steering Committee tasks are:
- To give directions and technical input to the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park development and management policy;
- To give clarification to the government policies relating to or impacting upon the implementation of the partnership programme;
- To give recommendations to the Director General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation and the Ministry of Forestry for policy decisions relating to the Aketajawe Lolobata National Park management;
- To hold a meeting at least once a year to discuss achievements and problems faced in implementing the partnership programme and to assist in finding solutions.

The members of the Steering Committee changed twice during the project period due to the Ministry of Forestry#s internal staff rotation mechanism. This condition impacted upon the quantity of consultations and communication between the project team and the Steering Committee related to the project updates and problem solving for priority issues raised during 2010 to the end of 2011.

The Steering Committee held three coordination meetings during the project implementation period. First meeting was held in Ternate in 2009, the second was held in Jakarta in November 2011, and the third one was held in February 2012 in Manado, North Sulawesi.

Efficiency : Rated Satisfactory

Comment:
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.
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. In effect, whilst significant work was done on the background and baseline studies in the first two years of the project, the results of this work only were beginning to have effect in terms of the project/#s expected outcomes from 2011 onwards.

The selection of Burung Indonesia as beneficiary to implement the project 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 could monitor efficiently the progress of the activities on Halmahera island. The project team had satisfactory technical and administrative support from the head office staff and the actual counterpart co-financing from Burung Indonesia was less than anticipated. There were also 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. 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. A global analysis tracking progress in managing protected areas around the world by WWF of 94 Protected Areas in East Asia Pacific resulted in a mean total score of 50.4. Taking into account an increase of 49 points over 5 years, the 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 has 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 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 Fondacion 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.

**Replicability: Rated Uncertain**

**Comment:**
This project had a specific component to ensure the replicability of the collaborative management approach in other protected areas, and for the lessons and guidelines for this approach to be endorsed in the policy and legal framework of the Ministry of Forestry. The lessons and experience from the project can certainly be used in designing collaborative management approaches in other protected areas, and some progress has been made in the form of exchanges between ALNP and four other protected areas.

**Main recommendations to stakeholders:**
##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.
##Changing the attitudes and practice behaviour of communities requires a continuing program of socialization and information. Short term interventions can establish curriculums and programs and make the investments in training capacity, but should also be designed to embed this capacity in government agencies so that the programs continue in the longer term, financed by government budgets. Indicators for awareness/education components should measure change, but also should gauge their achievements by the commitment of government to continue the activities after the intervention is complete.
##Similarly for building the capacity of government conservation agencies, this is a continuing process, as is staff development in any organization. Short term interventions correctly should provide initial training, but also should strive to ensure that agencies recognise the crucial importance of ongoing staff training, and make provisions in their budgets to finance it. Achievement indicators should reflect this.
##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.
##Insufficient attention is paid to establishing effective ground-level capacity in protected areas. National parks frequently
have fully staffed and budgeted head offices, but insufficient capacity in responding to local conflicts, to local infringements on resource use and encroachment, and in providing monitoring information to enable management plans to adapt to changing threats. Dealing with challenges concerning the civil service, and the recruitment and training of field staff needs to be addressed in project design.

Main recommendations to Bank Management:

### A GEF intervention through an NGO can rapidly deploy resources and staff to accelerate the protection of newly gazetted protected areas, whilst working in conjunction with the establishment of government agencies which tend to take time to be effective. A medium sized grant project will not have the resources required to fully complete the process of building the capacity of a newly formed government conservation agency but can serve as an effective catalyst.

### Having an NGO implement the project on behalf of the Government has been the norm in Indonesia for GEF medium-size biodiversity projects for some time. In the case of this project, the NGO was able to start the work swiftly and fill-in the void caused by thin government resources available at the start of the project without completely overtaking the client's responsibilities. For full-size projects it would be preferable to have the government implement due to larger fund allocations requiring strong government buy-in.

### It is also evident, that reliance on NGOs can also lead the client (Ministry of Forestry in this case) to not pay enough attention in the implementation, if the project is not directly within the client's priorities. Not having a steering committee in place for almost three years at the MoFor implies the low buy-in of the client to this project.

### On safeguards issues, the NGO was, according to the Grant Agreement, responsible for implementation of safeguards within the project but also in the National Park itself. This requirement is impossible for an NGO to comply with: the NGO does not have the authority over the management of the NP. Thus in future Grants, if an NGO is implementing, the government should be required to shoulder the responsibility over safeguards pertaining to the NP itself, while the implementing NGO would be responsible for the project's adherence to safeguards instruments.

### 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.

### PROCESSING

**Manager's comments on this GRM report:**

Date:11/05/2013 User ID:WB208109 Name:Mr Nathan M. Belete Operation performed:Approved by Manager

This grant clearly had mixed results in terms of its achievements. The team is to be commended for the candid report and trying to measure the overall GEO achievement which we understand is the primary reason for downgrading the achievements of the grant.

Date:10/07/2013 User ID:WB208109 Name:Mr Nathan M. Belete Operation performed:Comments to TTL

Hi Juha,

Sincere apologies for the delay in reviewing this but I have just been so swamped since taking the job and still trying to crawl out of the woods. Sounds like an interesting piece of work that was undertaken but I'm a little confused by the ratings. I understand why you rated the outcome as moderately unsatisfactory given the seeming challenges with achieving the overall objective of strengthening management/institutions with a view to helping conserve park. However, there's a real disconnect with the ratings on the component achievements as they are all uniformly satisfactory (except M&E)? One would read this to mean that the grant has achieved its objectives if all the components were implemented satisfactorily. However, you then
repeat the seemingly poor performance in the outcome indicators (which explains rating in comp description). I'm going to send back to you to adjust ratings but just wanted to send this you by email and copy Werner in case I am missing something as the new kid on the block . . .

Nathan
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DISBURSEMENTS

Disbursements Summary in USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Planned Cumulative</th>
<th>Planned Period</th>
<th>Actual Cumulative</th>
<th>Actual Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2007</td>
<td>12/31/2007</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>138,559.26</td>
<td>88,559.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2008</td>
<td>12/31/2008</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>203,822.50</td>
<td>65,263.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2009</td>
<td>06/30/2009</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>203,822.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2009</td>
<td>12/31/2009</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>274,243.83</td>
<td>70,421.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2010</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>359,327.89</td>
<td>85,084.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>12/31/2010</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>415,584.38</td>
<td>56,256.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2011</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507,976.61</td>
<td>92,392.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2011</td>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>624,366.66</td>
<td>116,390.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2012</td>
<td>06/30/2012</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>755,972.54</td>
<td>131,605.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2012</td>
<td>12/31/2012</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>913,916.66</td>
<td>157,944.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2013</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>930,751.82</td>
<td>16,835.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>