

# Terminal Evaluation

## Asia

### 1. Outline of the Project

**Country:**

Indonesia

**Project title:**

Biodiversity Conservation Project Phase 2

**Issue/Sector:**

Natural Environment Conservation

**Cooperation scheme:**

Project-type Technical Cooperation

**Division in charge:**

Forestry and Environment Division,  
Forestry and Natural Environment Department

**Total cost:**

878 million yen

**Period of Cooperation** 1 Jul 1998 - 30 Jun  
2003

**Partner Country's Implementing Organization:**

Indonesian Institute of Science(LIPI)  
Directorate General for Forest Protection and Nature Conservation, Ministry of  
Forestry (PHKA)

**Supporting Organization in Japan:**

Ministry of the Environment

**Related Cooperation:**

Grant Aid; "Biodiversity Conservation Project"

Project-type Technical Cooperation; "Biodiversity Conservation Project (phase 1)"

### 1-1 Background of the Project

The Indonesian government formulated 'The Biodiversity Action Plan for Indonesia' in 1991 and advocated the protection of natural environment for biodiversity conservation. Meanwhile, in the "Japan-US Global Partnership Action Plan", issued by the governments of Japan and the US in 1992, a program to manage and conserve the natural environment in developing countries was proposed as a Japan-US Environment Collaboration, and Indonesia was selected as the target country. Under these circumstances, the US government founded the "Indonesia Biodiversity Fund" and supported NGOs, while Japan constructed the Research and Development Center for Biology (RDCB) in Cibinong, the Nature Conservation Information Center (NCIC) in Bogor and a management office and research station in the Gnung Haimun National Park (GHNP) by Grand Aid.

Since then, from 1995 to 1998, the Project-type Technical Cooperation, 'Biodiversity Conservation Project (phase 1)', had been implemented for the purpose of promoting research on biodiversity and establishment of the habitat management model. As a result, basic organizational and structural capacities for biodiversity conservation were enhanced. Based on the results attained in phase 1, the Indonesian government requested the Japanese government for cooperation in the establishment of a natural environment survey research system and for an information management system, and implementation of a management program of national parks, in order to promote the technical transfer utilizing the utilities and equipment provided by Grant Aid.

### 1-2 Project Overview

The cooperation in establishment of an information management system, implementation of a natural environment survey and the establishment of a national park management system were conducted. The project consisted of five sub-projects, and the LIPI and PHKA respectively carried out the activities at the same time.

#### (1) Overall Goal

The achievement of the objectives of the National Strategy of Biodiversity management and the Biodiversity Action Plan for Indonesia is supported.

## (2) Project Purpose

Through organizational reinforcement of and collaboration with LIPI and PHKA,

- 1) Contribution of research activities at RDCB and LIPI on biodiversity conservation is increased. (Sub-Project A)
- 2) Data management (i.e. collection, provision and utilization of data) is improved in the Biology Information Center (BIC) and LIPI. (Sub-Project B)
- 3) Data management is enhanced at the Nature Conservation Information Center (NCIC). (Sub-Project C)
- 4) GHNP is managed properly based on the management plan. (Sub-Project D)
- 5) Results of project activities are effectively disseminated. (Sub-Project E)

## (3) Outputs

### 1) Sub-Project A

- a) Information and scientific data concerning Indonesian biodiversity for conservation (inside and outside the habitats) are augmented.
- b) Research equipment is well utilized.

### 2) Sub-Project B

- a) Improved systems to provide biodiversity data are available at BIC.
- b) BIC data is accessible on the Internet.
- c) The complete data provided to BIC is increased.
- d) The systems are maintained regularly and appropriately.

### 3) Sub-Project C

- a) Technical levels of NCIC staff are upgraded.
- b) Database management systems for the protected areas is completed and operated properly.
- c) The volume of data stored and managed by the NCIC database systems is increased.
- d) Concern for NCIC publications is promoted.

### 4) Sub-Project D

- a) Eco-tourism activities of PHKA are improved.
- b) Protection plans of specific endangered species are formulated.
- c) Utilization of GHNP as a comprehensive research field is promoted.
- d) Awareness of local communities in and around the biodiversity conservation is lifted.

### 5) Sub-Project E

- a) Project reports are published.
- b) Project workshops are held.
- c) Project leaflets are prepared.
- d) Project newsletters are published regularly.

## (4) Inputs

Japanese side:

Long-term Experts	11	Equipment	250 million yen
Short-term Experts	37	Local Cost	105 million yen
Trainees received	29		

## (5) Participant Countries

Counterparts	55	Equipments	
Land and Facilities			
Local Cost	2,619 Million rupiah (35 million yen)		

## 2. Evaluation Team

### Members of Evaluation Team

Team Leader/ General: Hideki, MIYAKAWA, Director of Forestry and Natural Environment Department  
Survey Training/ Information System: Kazuhiro, YAMASE, Executive Director, Japan Wildlife Research Center  
Management of Protected Areas: Kichi, MIMURA, Deputy Managing Director, Chubu Regional Office for Nature Conservation, Ministry of the Environment  
Integrated Evaluation: Chihiro SAITO, Office of Evaluation and Post Project Monitoring, Planning and Evaluation Department, JICA  
Planning Analysis: Takeshi, ASANO, Associate Expert, Forestry and Environment Division, Forestry and Natural Environment Department  
Evaluation Analysis: Masanori, DOI, INTEM Consulting, Inc.

**Period of Evaluation** 6 Oct 2002 - 1 Nov 2002      **Evaluation Type:** Terminal Evaluation

## 3. Results of Evaluation

### 3-1 Summary of Evaluation Results

---

#### (1) Relevance

The overall goal is in accordance with the development plan and biodiversity conservation policy of the Indonesian government, so it was appropriately aimed. In addition, the LIPI and PHKA prioritized biodiversity conservation higher and the project purpose and the respective sub-project purpose were consistent with the demands of the LIPI and PHKA. Moreover, the implementing organizations of the sub-projects were appropriately assigned since the LIPI has scientific authority and the PHKA has legal mandate for the biodiversity conservation management.

#### (2) Effectiveness

The institutional capacity of the LIPI and PHKA was strengthened by a number of collaboration activities. For instance, more than twenty researchers of the LIPI utilize the GHNP as a place of field survey, and the results of the research are applied to park management of the GHNP. Thus, the project purpose was accomplished based on the results of the respective sub-projects. Through the sub-projects, the techniques of the counterparts were improved and the importance of collaboration among the implementing organizations was recognized. As a result, institutional capacity to conserve biodiversity and framework for mutual cooperation were developed. Though at the time of terminal evaluation, a few activities were not completed, it was estimated that they would be achieved by the end of the project and contribute to the achievement of the project purpose.

#### (3) Efficiency

The inputs of the Grant Aid and Phase 1 were used in the project and contributed to the effective implementation of the project. On the other hand, some facilities and equipments introduced under Grand Aid were not utilized well, because some conditional assumptions may have been overlooked when the program was designed. The inputs of the project itself were confined to that of high necessity, and the outputs were accomplished with limited inputs. In order to promote an effective collaboration among sub-project A, B, C, D and E, the activities for the collaboration among the implementing organizations should have been clarified in the Project Design Matrix (PDM) of each sub-project.

#### (4) Impact

It is difficult to measure the exact achievement made by the project because specific achievement plans and achievement indicators were not set in the Biodiversity Action Plan for Indonesia. However, most of the activities of the project were implemented in conjunction with the action plans designed, and it was estimated that the project has significant impact on the achievement of the Action Plan.

In addition, the project played roles not only in promoting coordination among scientific research institutions for biodiversity conservation and institutions in charge of policy implementation, but also in stimulating the activities of other organizations and NGOs inside and outside Indonesia.

## (5) Sustainability

The Indonesian government reviewed The Biodiversity Action Plan for Indonesia at the time of terminal evaluation and is planning to reflect the contents to the next National Development Plan. It is then expected that the government promotes biodiversity conservation policies from now on. Furthermore, the LIPI and PHKA are going to promote biodiversity conservation and cooperate with each other for an effective implementation of biodiversity conservation activities. In aspect of human resources, the technical capacities of the counterparts in the respective sub-projects have reached the satisfactory level in order to manage project activities on their own. Though the financial sustainability of the implementing organizations is low, each implementing organization has taken necessary measures to secure budgets after the termination of the project.

### 3-2 Factors that promoted realization of effects

---

#### (1) Factors Concerning the Planning

As the project in LIPI and PHKA was aimed at implementing comprehensive activities concerning survey research and management of the Protected Areas, the collaboration system brought interchanges of human resources in both of the implementing organizations and multiple effects were also observed to bring about the results. Therefore, the institutional capacity for biodiversity conservation was enhanced.

#### (2) Factors concerning the Implementation Process

The activities were conducted according to the PDM. The monitoring of the activities was carried out on regular basis and the management of the project was implemented well. With regard to the Joint Steering Committee, it was hard to assemble all the members for the Committee. However, the project in general, was implemented with the full support by the Indonesian government, the Japanese government, and the supporting committee in Japan.

### 3-3 Factors that impeded realization of effects

---

#### (1) Factors Concerning the Planning

- 1) Activities concerning the collaboration among the implementing organizations should have been described clearly in the PDM of each sub-project in order to implement more efficient collaboration among the implementing organizations of sub-projects.
- 2) The cooperation of the project was positioned in the 'Japan-US Global Partnership Action Plan' and was focused on Japan-US collaboration, but the framework of collaboration with the US was not included in the PDM. In addition, the collaboration was not ample since the monitoring was not conducted after the cooperation was in progress. In order to promote collaboration and coordination with other aid organizations, the collaboration framework should be included in the project activities.

#### (2) Factors concerning the Implementation Process

The PDM was reviewed and revised based on the recommendations made by the mid-term evaluation team (Project Consultation), but it took time for the Indonesian side and the Japanese side to give the revised PDM official approval, and the people involved in the project had different recognition on the specific goals.

### 3-4 Conclusion

---

Judged comprehensively from the evaluation results of the sub-projects, the project was successfully implemented and will achieved the project purpose by the end of the project period. The project was composed of the five sub-projects, and the scope was quite large. However, plenty of the activities were conducted in collaboration among the sub-projects and results of each activity were enhanced, resulting in contributions to biodiversity conservation in Indonesia. In particular, the results of various survey researches in the RDCB were applied to the park management in GHNP. In addition, the inputs implemented in the project generally contributed to the effective implementation of the project activities. Through the project activities, the technical capacities of the counterparts were improved enough enabling them to conduct activities by themselves. However, more efforts were required in terms of securing institutional and financial sustainability. Particularly due to the frequent disposition of the counterparts, the institutional sustainability of the project was impeded. Moreover, the BIC/ RCB and NCIC/ PHKA needed to have official status in their organizational charts. It is expected that the Indonesian government gives consideration to the improvement of the institutional and financial sustainability in order to continuously carry out activities related to the project.

### 3-5 Recommendations

---

- (1) The implementing organizations should recruit and train young researchers and staff in order to maintain the technical standard on the long run.
- (2) It is recommended that the LIPI and PHKA discuss the terms and conditions for collaboration to mutually agree by the Minute of Understandings.

(3) It is evaluated that the research and survey activities were achieved well by the project. From now on, the survey research activities which contribute to local communities in terms of income generation and environmental aspects, need to be further developed.

(4) It is expected that the community-oriented environmental education and eco-tourism, developed through the project, has high potentials to be a new model applied to other national parks. To establish a better model for community-oriented environmental education and eco-tourism, it is expected that JICA continue technical cooperation, focusing on GHNP and other national parks in collaboration with RCB.

### **3-6 Lessons Learned**

---

(1) It is difficult to appropriately measure the results of survey research activities of Sub-Project A only by the quantitative indicators (the number of articles and reports) used for this evaluation. For this reason, it is desired to set qualitative indicators in survey research activities to confirm the quality of articles and reports. For instance, the indicators can be published in academic journals or quoted by other articles.

(2) Information management and database development are conducted according to the global standard. In Indonesia, engineers of private companies in those fields have become capable of these tasks. In the Sub-Project B and C, those engineers were employed as on-site consultants and brought about the impacts. For this field in the future, on-site consultants should be actively and efficiently utilized in order to assure sustainability in terms of the expense and aftercare services and to establish an on-site supporting system and enhance technical sustainability.

(3) In the project, the activities were implemented utilizing the equipment which was provided by the Grant Aid. However, a part of them was not used because it was not required urgently. It is desired in terms of technical cooperation projects collaborating with Grant Aid, that the equipment is carefully selected based on discussions among the personnel involved from the planning phase so that each project can be co-related and the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects are improved.

### **3-7 Follow-up Situation**

---

Based on the recommendations mentioned above, a five-year technical cooperation project for establishing the management system of GHNP with the participants from neighboring communities will be implemented in the end of fiscal year 2003.