

Summary of Terminal Evaluation Study Results

1. Outline of the Project	
Country: Indonesia	Project title: Gunung Halimun-Salak National Park Management Project
Issue/Sector: Environment (natural environment)	Cooperation scheme: Technical cooperation project
Division in charge: Forestry and Nature Conservation Team 1, Global Environment Department	Total cost (at the time of evaluation): approx. 510 million yen
Period of Cooperation (R/D) February 1, 2004 – January 31, 2009 (Date of conclusion): December 29, 2003 (Extension): (F/U): (E/N): (Grant aid)	Partner Country's Implementing Organization: Forest Protection and Nature Conservation(PHKA), Ministry of Forestry (PHKA) Nature Conservation Information Center (NCIC), Ministry of Forestry (NCIC)
	Supporting Organization in Japan: Ministry of the Environment
	Related Cooperation: Individual Expert
<p>1-1 Background of the Project</p> <p>With its hot and humid tropical climate, the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter "Indonesia") is known as one of the countries with the richest biodiversity in the world. However, rapid population growth and industrial development have led to an increasing demand for land, resulting in the deforestation of rain forests and the decrease in forest coverage. The situation has raised concerns over the destruction of natural environment and the reduction in the number of species.</p> <p>To address such concerns, Government of Indonesia established the Indonesian Biodiversity Action Plan (BAPI) in 1991, by way of promoting biodiversity conservation in the country. Such effort was followed by the announcement of the "US-Japan Global Partnership Action Plan" by Governments of Japan and United States (US) in 1992, to implement a Japan-US joint environmental project to manage and conserve natural resources in developing countries including Indonesia. .It was against this backdrop that Government of Indonesia requested Government of Japan a technical cooperation project (TCP) and grant aid that would assist the implementation of conservation activities appropriate for Indonesia. Japan responded to this request by implementing Biodiversity Conservation Project (BCP (Phase I from 1995 to 1998 and Phase II from 1998 to 2003)), and by constructing with grant aid the facilities useful for biodiversity conservation (1997).</p> <p>Building on the past cooperation above, the Gunung Halimun-Salak National Park Management Project was proposed to Japan by Government of Indonesia in 2002. The Project is to be implemented over planned 5 years from February 2004, in cooperation with a counterpart organization (C/P) of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (PHKA) within the Ministry of Forestry. . The aim of the Project is to refine the park management methods and biodiversity conservation skills acquired through the above-mentioned TCP and grant aid, as well as to establish park management methodologies taking Gunung Halimun-Salak National Park (GHSNP) as a model case and disseminate, through workshops</p>	

and training, the knowledge and skills developed through the Project to other national parks.

Anticipating the Project completion in half a year, this evaluation study was undertaken to provide overall evaluation of the Project, with regard to its prospect of achieving Project Goals and of 5 evaluation criteria. The study also summarizes the lessons learned so far, and makes recommendations on the actions for the remaining project period and on the directions to be taken after the completion of the project.

1-2 Project Overview

[Overall Goal]

Biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource utilization are promoted in national parks in Indonesia..

[Project Purpose]

1. Biodiversity in Gunung Halimun-Salak National Park (GHSNP) is properly conserved and sustainable resource utilization are promoted in GHSNP.
2. Useful lessons and experiences on park management obtained through Biodiversity Conservation Project (BCP) and this project are shared with park managers, staff members of other national parks and officials of the Ministry of Forestry.

[Outputs]

- 1-1 The management framework of GHSNP is strengthened with involvement of many stakeholders such as local governments and local communities, and the policies/strategies for park management are shared by the stakeholders.
- 1-2 The information systems and media prerequisite to the management of other elements needed for park management are developed.
- 1-3 Researches on biodiversity of GHSNP are encouraged, and monitoring and protection of endangered species, particularly the three endangered species of Leopards, Java Hawk-eagles, Java Gibbons, are strengthened.
- 1-4 Conservation activities with local communities' participation and their sustainable natural resource utilization are encouraged in strategic locations of CHSNP, and these experiences are introduced to other villages in and around GHSNP. .
- 1-5 Function of GHSNP for eco-tourism, environmental education (EE) and promotion is strengthened.
- 2-1 Institutional and individual capabilities on managing GHSNP are strengthened.
- 2-2 Useful knowledge, skills/techniques and methodologies on national park management obtained through BCP are diffused to other national park management.

[Inputs (at the time of evaluation)]

Japanese side:

Long-term experts: 6 in total

Provision of equipment: approx. 37,700,000 yen

Short-term experts: 12 in total

Trainees received: 29 participants in Training and Dialogue Program,, 15 in Third-country Training Program (Malaysia)

Indonesian side:

Assignment of counterparts: 19 persons		Local cost: approx. 14,500,000 rupiahs (as of December 2007)
II. Evaluation Team		
Members of Evaluation Team	Team Leader: Shiro AKAMATSU, Senior Expert, JICA National Park Management: Hiroo UEHARA, Director, Japan Highway Landscape Association Evaluation Planning: Tsuyoshi KANDA, Forestry and Nature Conservation Team 1, Global Environment Department, JICA Evaluation Analysis: Yasuyo HIROUCHI, International Development Associates, Ltd.	
Period of Evaluation	July 20 – July 31, 2008	Type of Evaluation: Terminal
III. Results of Evaluation		
<p>3-1-1 Project Purpose</p> <p>(1) Project Purpose 1</p> <p>The management of GHSNP was improved as compared with the situation before the Project. The master plan (2007-2026) for the GHSNP management framework was already developed, and the strategic plan (5-year plan) and the annual plan are expected to be completed by the end of the Project. The management plan was prepared with the participation of various stakeholders. In addition, a temporary zoning map was produced when preparing the master plan of the management plan, resulting in the facilitation of appropriate zoning as compared to the situation before the Project. Objectively verifiable information on whether or not 1) the awareness of the public (community in GHSNP) improved, 2) the number of people engaging in illegal activities decreased, 3) the forest area in GHSNP increased, and 4) the speed of forest loss slowed down as compared with the situation before the Project, was not available.</p> <p>(2) Project Purpose 2</p> <p>The Ministry of Forestry in December 2006 selected GHSNP as one of model national parks, and the management of this park is regarded as a model case for other parks. 7 events were organized to share knowledge, skills, techniques, and methodologies with park managers and staff members of other national parks and with Ministry of Forestry officials. The events were attended by total 271 persons including the managers and staff members of other national parks and the officials of Ministry of Forestry</p> <p>3-2 Summary of Evaluation Results</p> <p>(1) Relevance</p> <p>The Project is considered to remain relevant at the present.</p> <p>The Overall Goal of biodiversity conservation is consistent with the needs of Indonesia. There is an urgent need in GHSNP to maintain rich biodiversity and important ecosystems in cooperation with local stakeholders, for the purpose of addressing, among others, illegal forest cutting, trespassing, diversion of forests to other uses, and the Project Goal is consistent with the organizational needs of PHKA and GHSNP. The Overall Goal and the Project Goal are consistent with the national development plan (2004-2009) of Indonesia and the Official Development Assistance policies of Japan. Japan's technical advantage was also confirmed in the area of collaborative park management, among others.</p> <p>(2) Effectiveness</p>		

The Project can be deemed generally effective.

Difficulty duly exists in confirming the accurate level of achievements of Project Goals, due to the ambiguity of some indicators and to the lack of original projection data. Nevertheless, the evaluation of those Goals to which measurement indicators are available confirmed improvements from the beginning of the Project. The Project Goals are thus generally expected to be attainable.

On individual Outputs, Output 1.1 through 1.5 are directly contributing to the Project Goal 1. While the contribution of Output 2.1 to the Project Goal 2 is modest, it has been confirmed that this Output is directly contributing to the Project Goal 1. Output 2.2 is contributing to the Project Goal 2.2. It is therefore concluded that the outputs as a whole are contributing to the achievement of Project Goals.

(3) Efficiency

Outputs have been produced steadily.

The timing, quality, and quantity of Indonesian and Japanese inputs have been generally appropriate in view of Output production. However, concerns are noted in the following points:

- Indonesian side: The assignment of C/P did not take place until 4 months into the Project in GHSNP, and for more than 1 year in NCIC. On the other hand, while total number of C/P personnel was maintained, there were frequent personnel changes resulted in only 5 of the 19 C/P personnel continuously serving from the beginning. Despite this fact, the adverse effect on Output production has been kept to minimum, owing to the efforts and commitment by C/P. The budget on the Indonesian side was not sufficient, and the execution of budget suffered from a delay of nearly 6 months. For this reason, JICA was often requested to bear part of the project implementation costs. The adverse effect on Output production has been minimized because JICA bears part of the costs as requested, in order to ensure smooth implementation of the Project.
- Japanese side: In light of the activities covered under the current PDM (ver. 02), the number of experts is not considered appropriate. When the initial Project Documents and PDM (ver. 0) were revised in November 2004, the scope of the Project expanded substantially, while the total number (and areas of assignments) of long-term experts remained unchanged. In order to cope with the insufficient number of Japanese experts, the expert team employed “local assistants” in April 2005, and they chose an approach of offering them the position of “local experts” in April 2007. As a result of this approach, the role of Japanese experts became more focused on the managerial aspect. Owing to the introduction of the new approach, and to the efforts and commitment of the C/P, the adverse effect of the insufficient number of experts on output production was kept to minimum.

Despite these challenges, the project inputs as a whole have been contributing to Output production thanks to the cooperation of the both sides. The efficiency of the Project is considered to be moderately good.

(4) Impact

Impact at the level of the Overall Goal: The Overall Goal is defined as a goal to be achieved within 3 years after the completion of the Project. The Overall Goal of this Project is ambitious, with little prospect to be attained within 3 years after the Project completion.

Other impacts: The study results confirmed various positive impacts. For example, GHSNP was selected as one of 21 model national parks designated by the Ministry of Forestry in 2006. The expansion of conservation activities such as forestation and patrol in collaboration with local communities has already begun. GHSNP has launched its own project for livelihood improvement in 7 communities. In addition, USAID is starting a support for joint conservation activities with local people, in one community in Sukabumi Regency and two communities in Bogor Regency. Further positive impacts were also identified, such as the raised awareness of local communities on wildlife preservation, and the change in their recognition of GHSNP. On the other hand, no serious negative impacts have been noted.

(5) Sustainability

While institutional and organizational sustainability is deemed as achievable, sustainability in the financial aspect will require the establishment of a financial mechanism that supports the implementation of the park management framework.

Institutional and organizational aspects: It is foreseen that Indonesia will continue its legal and political support for biodiversity conservation. As part of the organizational strategy of GHSNP after the end of the Project, there are the GHSNP management framework (2007-2026) developed through consultations with stakeholders, and the strategic plan (5-year plan) currently in the process of development. The cooperation with related organizations has been strengthened through project activities, and is expected to sustain after the end of the Project. The Project has started addressing the issue of high, recurrent staff turnover, by promoting on-the-job training (OJT) to maintain organizational skills and methodologies. The development of an OJT mechanism is considered effective for the sustainability of the project effects.

Financial aspect: JICA incurs part of project implementation costs to compensate C/P's limited budget and the delay in budget execution. The financial sustainability upon the end of the Project is uncertain: to supplement the budget from the Ministry of Forestry, GHSNP is exploring the feasibility of a "trust fund" for park management. Multiple companies located around the park also have expressed interest in this idea.

Technical aspect: The technical abilities of the C/P are improving steadily. The skills and knowledge transferred in the Project, as well as the products of the Project, are relevant to the needs of the organization and of the local communities. These are expected to be used effectively after the end of the Project. (However, some of them are predicated on a financial backup). No notable issues are identified on the maintenance of equipment.

3-3 Factors that Promoted Realization of Effects

(1) Factors Concerning to Planning

Nothing to note.

(2) Factors Concerning the Implementation Process

- When activities are conducted in the Project, a "special task team" is organized for each output. Initially, each team consisted of relevant C/P personnel, a Japanese expert, and a local assistant employed by JICA. This organization, however, was not able to respond sufficiently to increased Project activities after the revision of the PDM (see the description of issues concerning planning

below). From April 2007, each came to be comprised of relevant C/P personnel and a local expert (formerly a local assistant) and activities were conducted by the C/P with technical support from the local expert under the supervision of the Japanese expert team. However, because 2 local experts resigned afterwards, this arrangement is not functioning fully at the present.

- Activities were conducted in partnership with various stakeholders (local communities, provincial administrative bodies, non-governmental organizations, community organizations, universities, research institutions, etc.).
- Toward the latter half of the Project, an internal monitoring system was reinforced. For example, quarterly general meetings attended by all C/P staff were introduced in October 2007.
- As mentioned in “(3) Efficiency”, JICA bears part of the project implementation costs that should normally be incurred by the Indonesian side, for the purpose of ensuring smooth implementation of the Project. There were ambiguities concerning the items and the percentage to be borne. To solve this issue, “Agreement on the Budget Sharing Activities of GHSNP and JICA” was reached in August 2007, accompanied by the lists of budget items to be borne by JICA and their average costs.
- The initiative taken by the C/Ps on the management level, in particular the GHSNP management facilitated the smooth implementation of activities.

3-4 Factors that Impeded Realization of Effects

(1) Factors Concerning Planning

- Responding to the needs that arose as a result of the expansion of the park area before the beginning of the Project in June 2003, revisions were made to the Project Document and the PDM, 9 months after the beginning of the Project. General rule states that the accuracy of the PDM relates to the level of ownership of participating stakeholders, as well as to the amount of information accumulated on various project elements; in light of this rule, commencing the discussion to amend the Project Design at the very beginning of the Project is considered too early. In addition, despite that the scope of activities was expanded substantially at that time and the details of activities were also changed, no modification was made to Input Plan, including to the total number of long-term experts and the areas of their expertise. Neither was there a close examination of a strategy to close the gap between the scope of activities and the inputs .
- In all previous PDMs, from the initial version to the current, ambiguity remains in the descriptions of certain components. In particular, many of the indicators in the document lack for clear definitions and for the criteria to measure achievement. In the PO, essential data such as “expected results,” “responsible agency,” “implementing agency,” and “required inputs” were not specified and some descriptions remain ambiguous. As a result, it was difficult to share a clear and common understanding on the overall project implementation process, the progress of activities, outputs, and the achievement of project goals.

(2) Factors Concerning to the Implementation Process

- Project management has not been conducted appropriately. Joint Coordination Committee (JCC) did not meet for nearly 2 years after the first meeting, and of 3 major functions of JCC defined in the R/D, two are not properly implemented. The two are namely: (i) the approval of Annual PO (APO) and (ii) the review of the overall progress of technical cooperation programs and of the activities conducted based on the above-mentioned APO, among others. Furthermore, no PO existed for 9 months from the beginning of the Project until the first revision was made to the PDM, and neither was one produced for 4 months after the second revision to the PDM. These facts indicate that the activities were

conducted without a PO (a well-defined plan) for about one-third of the Project period. The fact that not even an APO was existent in the years up to 2008 inevitably shows that the progress management based on PO/APO was not possible in this period. Semi-annual reports were neither prepared during the first year of the Project, indicating that monitoring was particularly insufficient in this period.

- At the second revision to the PDM, Lebak Regency was listed as a target of the local community livelihood improvement activities to be jointly conducted by regencies and GHSNP. However, Lebak Regency had long been opposed to the expansion of the park area, and without a solution to the demarcation issue amenable for both parties, Lebak Regency refrained from participating in the Project activities since 2007. The Regency's resignation has resulted in a delay in related activities. Due to this difficulty cooperating with the Regency, GHSNP is starting a negotiation with Lebak Provincial Government.
- Although local experts are expected to play a role as a "bridge" between the C/P and Japanese experts, in situations requiring decision making, their role has not been performed as fully as expected. In particular, planning of daily activities in the field requires frequent stakeholder consultations on who to incur how much cost, even after the agreement on budget sharing is signed. In such cases, if decision-making is not delegated to local experts who visit the field, discussions may take long and at times causes delay in project activities.
- The role of NCIC in the project has not been defined clearly.

3-5 Recommendations (specific measures, suggestions and advice related to the Project)

Until the end of the Project

- (1) Review of the PO schedule for the remaining period, prioritization of project activities, and necessary modifications of the PO.
- (2) Establishment of smooth communication between the expert team and the C/P.
- (3) Further clarification of the details of budget sharing.
- (4) Adequate analysis of satellite images purchased in the Project.
- (5) Further consideration of the financial mechanism for the support after the Project period.
- (6) Preparation of the inventory of provided equipment.
- (7) Preparation of the final report of the project and submission to relevant organizations.

After the end of the Project

- (1) Steady implementation of the GHSNP management plan, construction of a concrete and reliable management system, and the establishment of an appropriate liaison system for collaborative park management.
- (2) Sharing of knowledge and experience acquired in the Project, with other parks in- and outside of Indonesia.
- (3) Further reinforcement of the OJT mechanism for the sharing of experience, knowledge, and skills within GHSNP.

3-6 Lessons Learned (Cases from this Project that may be a reference for the identification, formulation, implementation, and management of other similar projects)

- (1) Revision to the PDM should wait till the ownership of stakeholders have sufficiently grown and information on the Project accumulated.
- (2) Project design should be commensurate with the size of input.
- (3) Project management should appropriately utilize PDM and PO.

