

Country Name	Project on Capacity Building for Restoration of Ecosystems in Conservation Areas
Republic of Indonesia	

I. Project Outline

Background	<p>Forests in Indonesia had suffered from a high pressure from timber production, oil palm plantation, forest fire, and natural disasters even in officially designated conservation areas. In recognition that conservation areas and national parks, in particular, play a central role in biodiversity conservation in Indonesia, the restoration of the degraded forests was given a policy priority by the Ministry of Forestry (MoF). However, institutional, technical and financial capacity of the then Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (PHKA), a department in charge of managing conservation areas, national park offices, and other relevant stakeholders, was not sufficient for restoration of the ecosystem in the conservation areas.</p> <p>* Organization names are as of the time of ex-ante evaluation.</p>																						
Objectives of the Project	<p>The project aimed to strengthen the capacity of relevant stakeholders for restoration of degraded land in conservation areas in Indonesia through enhancement of institutional framework, development of restoration plans of degraded land, and implementation of the restoration activities in the project sites, thereby promoting restoration of degraded land contributing to ecosystem health in conservation areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Goal: Restoration of degraded land contributing to ecosystem health in conservation areas is promoted. Project Purpose: Capacity of relevant stakeholders for restoration of degraded land in conservation areas is strengthened 																						
Activities of the Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project Site: Jakarta and five national parks (NPs)¹ Main Activities: preparation of a draft of restoration guideline; formulation of working groups (WGs) and preparation of restoration plans for the project sites; training in and demonstration of restoration; etc. Inputs (to carry out above activities) (as of Terminal Evaluation in September 2014) <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Japanese Side</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Indonesian Side</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Experts: (Long-term) 4 persons; (Short-term) 1 person</td> <td>1) Staff Allocated: 19 persons from PHKA and 5 project site NPs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Trainees Received: 18 persons</td> <td>2) Land and Facilities: An office and meeting room for experts at MoF headquarters</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Equipment: Vehicles, motorbikes, boat, office equipment, etc.</td> <td>3) Local Cost: Travel cost, etc.</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Local Activity Costs: Cost for construction of facilities (huts, small bridge, etc.), travel, local consultant, etc.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			Japanese Side	Indonesian Side			1) Experts: (Long-term) 4 persons; (Short-term) 1 person	1) Staff Allocated: 19 persons from PHKA and 5 project site NPs			2) Trainees Received: 18 persons	2) Land and Facilities: An office and meeting room for experts at MoF headquarters			3) Equipment: Vehicles, motorbikes, boat, office equipment, etc.	3) Local Cost: Travel cost, etc.			4) Local Activity Costs: Cost for construction of facilities (huts, small bridge, etc.), travel, local consultant, etc.			
Japanese Side	Indonesian Side																						
1) Experts: (Long-term) 4 persons; (Short-term) 1 person	1) Staff Allocated: 19 persons from PHKA and 5 project site NPs																						
2) Trainees Received: 18 persons	2) Land and Facilities: An office and meeting room for experts at MoF headquarters																						
3) Equipment: Vehicles, motorbikes, boat, office equipment, etc.	3) Local Cost: Travel cost, etc.																						
4) Local Activity Costs: Cost for construction of facilities (huts, small bridge, etc.), travel, local consultant, etc.																							
Project Period	March 2010 to March 2015	Project Cost	(ex-ante) 380 million yen, (actual) 382 million yen																				
Implementing Agency	<p>General Directorate of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (PHKA), Ministry of Forestry (MoF)</p> <p>* MoF has been merged to Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) and PHKA into the Directorate General of Ecosystem and Natural Resources Conservation (KSDAE) by the time of ex-post evaluation.</p>																						
Cooperation Agency in Japan	Forestry Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries																						

II. Result of the Evaluation

<Constraints on Evaluation>

- Due to time and budget constraints, the evaluator did not visit the project site NPs. The evaluator collected the information on the NPs from the questionnaire and interview with KSDAE and each of the five project site NPs at an evaluation meeting held in Jakarta inviting them and others for this evaluation.

<Special Perspective Considered in the Ex-Post Evaluation>

- The evaluator examined the status of achievement of selected Output Indicators at the time of ex-post evaluation as Supplementary Information to confirm the continuation status of the restoration activities in the five project site NPs.
- The project plan did not identify the target year and the target number for the Overall Goal Indicators (1. Restoration plan(s) of other NPs reflecting the result of the project are prepared. 2. Restoration activities reflecting the result of the project are initiated in other NPs). In this evaluation, we consider year 2020 as the target year based on the definition “within 3-5 years after the Project” in the Terminal Evaluation Summary. As for the target number, while referring to (as a guide) a description of the Terminal Evaluation Report that PHKA identified six candidate conservation areas for dissemination after project completion, we examined whether the actual number is sufficient in view of the Overall Goal.

1 Relevance

<Consistency with the Development Policy of Indonesia at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion>

At the time of ex-ante evaluation and project completion, the project was consistent with Indonesia’s “National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN)” (2010-2014) and PRJMN (2015-2019), which both included rehabilitation of degraded land as a key action for the environment and natural disaster agenda.

< Consistency with the development Needs of Indonesia at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation and Project Completion >

The project was consistent with the development needs of Indonesia for restoration of degraded land in conservation areas as described

¹ Sembilang (South Sumatra), Gunung Ciremai (West Java), Gunung Merapi (Jogjakarta, Central Java), Bromo Tengger Semeru (East Java), and Manupeu Tanah Daru (Nusa Tenggara Timur). It is noted Sembilang NP and Manupeu Tanah Daru NP have been respectively merged to Berbak NP and Laiwangi Wanggameti NP.

in “Background” at the time of ex-ante evaluation. Changes in the needs were not reported at the time of project completion.

<Consistency with Japan’s ODA Policy at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

At the time of ex-ante evaluation, the project was consistent with the “Country Assistance Program for the Republic of Indonesia” (2004), which aimed at “improving the administrative abilities and strengthening the systems of the central and local governments involved in natural resource management, developing human resources, and spreading environmental education to Indonesian citizens”.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the relevance of the project is high.

2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement of the Project Purpose at the time of Project Completion>

The Project Purpose was achieved by the time of project completion. The Restoration Guideline was developed as planned (Indicator 1), and skills and knowledge of the relevant stakeholders (PHKA (presently KSDAE), the five project site NPs and local communities) to utilize the institutional framework, restoration techniques, and finance for restoration of degraded land were improved by training and restoration activities (Indicator 2).

<Continuation Status of Project Effects at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The project effects have continued to the time of ex-post evaluation. The Restoration Guideline developed by the project has been further disseminated within MoEF and to NPs and utilized. According to KSDAE, the stakeholders have maintained the acquired capacity by utilizing the Restoration Guideline. All of the five project site NPs have prepared and implemented detailed plans for the project restoration sites, and they have conducted restoration activities to more than 1,483 ha of degraded land (as compared to approx. 476 ha under the project during its implementation period) with their own budget and/or external funds. According to the staffs of the five NPs, the local community members of former WGs have also maintained the acquired capacity by utilizing the Restoration Guideline and participating in training and extension program conducted by the NPs.

<Status of Achievement for Overall Goal at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The Overall Goal has been partially achieved by the time of ex-post evaluation and is possible to be achieved by the target year 2020. Utilizing the results of the project, namely the Restoration Guideline, five other NPs have prepared restoration plans (Indicator 1) and at least one of them has initiated restoration activities based on the plans (Indicator 2). KSDAE considered the number of the NPs (i.e., five) was appropriate to promote restoration of degraded land contributing to ecosystem health in conservation areas because those NPs represent all type of ecosystems in Indonesia.

<Other Impacts at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

According to Berbak NP (former Sembilang NP), its project restoration sites which was located within the designated area by NP for restoration (called as restoration zone) have been successfully recovered by mangrove planted by the project. The project sites was reported to be in good condition and so ideal for the ecosystem to recover itself. This sustainable condition had the NP decided to exclude this area from the restoration. Meanwhile, no negative impacts of the project have been observed.

<Evaluation Result>

Therefore, the effectiveness/impact of the project is high.

Achievement of Project Purpose and Overall Goal

Aim	Indicators	Results												
(Project Purpose) Capacity of relevant stakeholders for restoration of degraded land in conservation areas is strengthened	1. Draft of Restoration Guideline that covers the necessary aspects (institutional, technical and financial) is in place.	Status of the Achievement: achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - As Restoration Guideline, “Process Guidelines for the Restoration of Degraded land in Conservation Areas (Process Guideline)” and “Technical Manual for the Restoration of Degraded Land in Conservation Areas (Technical Manual)” were developed and disseminated to MoF (presently MoEF). (Ex-post Evaluation) - The Restoration Guideline has been disseminated to 71 Technical Units under KSDAE and NPs (number unknown) and utilized by them.												
	2. Relevant stakeholders (*) are equipped with the capacity to develop the restoration activities (**). (* Refers to the PHKA officials and those involved in the restoration of degraded land in national parks. (**) Refers to the knowledge and skills of those stakeholders to utilize the institutional framework, restoration techniques and finance for restoration of degraded areas.	Status of the Achievement: achieved (continued) (Project Completion) - The Restoration Guideline helped PHKA (presently KSDAE) identify the shape of institutional framework to implement restoration activities. - The ability of NP staff and local community (members of the former WGs) learned restoration techniques through training. - MoF (presently MoEF) and the NPs gained experience to utilize external finances. (Ex-post Evaluation) - The stakeholders have maintained the acquired capacity by utilizing the Restoration Guideline and conducting restoration activities in other than the project sites as shown in the table below. < Restoration area other than the project restoration sites in the project site NPs>												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>NP</th> <th>Area and budget source</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sembilang (presently Berbak)</td> <td>(No data; the NP said they planned and implemented the restoration activities.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gunung Ciremai</td> <td>60 ha (supported by JICS) and 50 ha (supported by Yamaha Music)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gunung Merapi</td> <td>8.5 ha (by NP’s budget)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bromo Tengger Semeru</td> <td>112 ha (supported by JICS)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manuparu Tanah Daru (presently Laiwangi Wanggameti)</td> <td>261 ha (supported by JICS) and 800 ha (by NP’s budget)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NP	Area and budget source	Sembilang (presently Berbak)	(No data; the NP said they planned and implemented the restoration activities.)	Gunung Ciremai	60 ha (supported by JICS) and 50 ha (supported by Yamaha Music)	Gunung Merapi	8.5 ha (by NP’s budget)	Bromo Tengger Semeru	112 ha (supported by JICS)	Manuparu Tanah Daru (presently Laiwangi Wanggameti)	261 ha (supported by JICS) and 800 ha (by NP’s budget)
NP	Area and budget source													
Sembilang (presently Berbak)	(No data; the NP said they planned and implemented the restoration activities.)													
Gunung Ciremai	60 ha (supported by JICS) and 50 ha (supported by Yamaha Music)													
Gunung Merapi	8.5 ha (by NP’s budget)													
Bromo Tengger Semeru	112 ha (supported by JICS)													
Manuparu Tanah Daru (presently Laiwangi Wanggameti)	261 ha (supported by JICS) and 800 ha (by NP’s budget)													
		Note: JICS: Japan International Cooperation System												
(Overall Goal) Restoration of	1. Restoration plan(s) of other NPs reflecting the	(Ex-post Evaluation) achieved - Five other NPs (Merbabu NP, Manusela NP, Gunung Palung NP, Baluran NP, and Rawa Aopa												

degraded land contributing to ecosystem health in conservation areas is promoted.	result of the project are prepared.	Watumohai NP) have prepared restoration plans, reflecting the result of the project, namely the Restoration Guideline.
	2. Restoration activities reflecting the result of the project are initiated in other NPs.	(Ex-post Evaluation) partially achieved - Out of the five other NPs mentioned above, at least Merbabu NP has initiated restoration activities, reflecting the result of the project. No information is available on the rest of the NPs.

Source: Terminal Evaluation Report; questionnaire and interview survey with KSDAE (former PHKA) and the five project site NPs

3 Efficiency

Although the project period was within the plan (ratio against the plan: 100%), the project cost slightly exceeded the plan (ratio against the plan: 101%). The Outputs of the project were produced as planned. Therefore, the efficiency of the project is fair.

4 Sustainability

<Policy Aspect>

“Natural resources conservation, environment and disaster management” is one of the priority strategic issues in RPJMN (2015-2019) and promotion of restoration of ecosystems in conservation areas is included in the “Strategic Plan” of KSDAE (2015-2019). Also, two Directorate General’s Decrees of KSDAE (November and December 2015) support the implementation of restoration activities in conservation areas.

<Institutional Aspect>

At the central level, KSDAE, which took over the role of PHKA, is responsible for restoration and ecosystem recovery in the conservation area in Indonesia. As of October 2018, eight officers were assigned for the relevant activities, which was commented by KSDAE as sufficient in number. At the five project site NPs, the number of the allocated staff for restoration of the ecosystem was two to four, which was less than the quota. Although restoration activities have been continuously promoted, these NPs stated the number of the staff was insufficient because the staff was also responsible for other tasks.

<Technical Aspect>

Most of the former counterpart personnel of the project have remained with KSDAE and the project site NPs and have sustained the capacity to promote restoration activities by utilizing the Restoration Guideline. According to the project site NPs, the provided equipment has been utilized in good condition except for the speed boat provided to Berbak NP, which has been broken down. Some of the constructed facilities for restoration activities, including the mangrove trail (Berkak NP) and the work hut (Gunung Meragi NP), have been underutilized because they have been damaged.

<Financial Aspect>

Although the promotion and implementation of restoration activities have continued as stated above, no concrete data on the budget amount was available. According to KSDAE, the allocation and expenditure of the national budget for promotion of restoration activities were slightly reduced due to other activities that had to be financed. Partnership with companies carrying out corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities and with academic institutions was not realized at the central level after project completion for unknown reasons. As for the five project site NPs, they all mentioned the limited budget from the central government, which have affected operations of NPs including monitoring of the restored area. Nevertheless, they all have managed to mobilize available financial resources to continue their activities.

<Evaluation Result>

Therefore, the sustainability of the effect through the project is fair.

5 Summary of the Evaluation

The project achieved the Project Purpose of strengthening the capacity of restoration of degraded land in conservation areas. The effects of the project have continued, and the Overall Goal of promoting restoration activities has been partially achieved by the time of the ex-post evaluation and is possible to be achieved by the target year 2020. Regarding the sustainability, some issues have been found in the institutional and financial aspects, namely, the insufficient workforce at the project site NPs, and insufficient national budget, and insufficient budgetary information, while no problems have been found in the policy aspect. As for the efficiency, the project cost slightly exceeded the plan. Considering all of the above points, this project is evaluated to be satisfactory.

III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

KSDAE is recommended to promote/introduce the dissemination of the practices, Restoration Guideline and the technical manual book of restoration activities in the project site NPs by proposing them into the curriculum in training centers such as the Center for Forestry and Education Training to the Directorate General of Human Resource Development and Extension of MoEF.

Lessons Learned for JICA:

It was good that the project incorporated the financing (capacity development for fund-raising) component, in addition to the technical component, in its restoration activities in each NP, which enabled the NPs to manage the partnership with private sector to continue restoration under the condition that the national budget allocation is limited.