CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International – Indonesia

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Grantmaking and Partnerships on the Ground in Sumatra

Implementation Partners for this Project: World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF), World Conservation Society (WCS) and the Ministry of Forestry (MoF)

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): January 1, 2005 - June 30, 2007

Date of Report (month/year): October 2, 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

This project is a continuation of the previous 2002 CEPF grant "CEPF Support of Local Partners in Sumatra" in which a CEPF grant manager is hosted by Conservation International (CI) Indonesia. The objective of the project is to raise the capacity of the civil society to undertake conservation projects, to build alliance to scale up biodiversity outcomes as specified in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile and the Vision Maps and to leverage follow-on funding on the current conservation efforts. A grant manager was hired to ensure that the administration and communication between CEPF and its grantees in Sumatra were managed effectively in the focal region (Northern Sumatra Biodiversity Region, Tesso Nilo corridor, Siberut Island and Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park)

CEPF was able to disburse \$10 million USD for 71 projects implemented by various civil societies as independent agents but still supporting the government on protecting the most threatened species, their habitats, and consolidating habitat corridors to ensure genetic flow still possible. In the end, CEPF had also built the capacity of the civil societies to be able to sustain their project beyond CEPF.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: The purpose of this project is to ensure that civil society in Sumatra at the district level and below successfully accesses CEPF funds and is successfully implementing projects in line with the Sumatra Ecosystem Profile.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion	
Purpose-level:		

Civil society in focal areas on Sumatra successfully applies for CEPF funds.	The online application system was enabling grantees to directly apply to CEPF, however with a grant manager on board supported by the technical team, advisory council, and the leading institutions (CI, WWF, WCS) had done a series of roadshows to disseminate the information on the grant availabilities.
Civil society is successfully implementing CEPF- funded projects that result in conservation of hectares and species in each of the four focal areas by the end of FY06.	Out of the Sumatra projects portfolio that were implemented, resulting in the establishment of 150,000 hectares of new protected area in Batang Gadis (NSC) and Teso Nilo. Possible expansion of up to 1 million hectares, and strengthen the management of at least 500,000 hectares of existing protected areas.
Major donors return to Indonesia to match at least 25% of CEPF's grants by FY07	Major bilateral donors such as USAID, USFWS, RNHP, STF and corporations (Newmont, EXXON) among others had provided leveraging to the CEPF grant. The unexpected impact of the tsunami in Aceh also provided a significant amount of funding for civil societies (BRR-MDF) to assist in the relief effort while still putting environmental and conservation aspects into consideration.
Civil society is able to sustain funding for 50% of its lowland-forest conservation efforts by December 2006.	Most of the supported civil society was able to sustain their projects beyond CEPF. Out of the \$10 million USD invested by CEPF, \$6.82 million USD had been leveraged which constitute 68.2% of CEPF funding

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

This project contributed to the success of the CEPF investment by way of creating an enabling condition for improving bilingual communication (English and Bahasa) between CEPF and the grantees in Sumatra. In addition, the project was creating a mechanism that enables access to the grants, follow up on grant processing, monitoring of the awarded grants, tracking projects accomplishment/reports etc. The project through the grant manager, worked externally with grantees and the CEPF Sumatra Advisory Council, internally with the DC based CEPF support, CI Indonesia finance and technical staff (Flying team) to structure and complete the process of grantmaking and following requirements (compliance) are managed effectively.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)? Not applicable

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion	
Output 1: CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager successfully soliciting and monitoring grants in the four areas of geographic focus on Sumatra.		
Grant Manager travels to each of the four focal areas (Northern Sumatra, Siberut,	At least 20 field visits were conducted over the 4 focal areas during the implementation of the	

project. During the trip the grant manager discussed relevant issues with grantees, including outputs and deliverables, challenges and changes in plan. Occasionally, in some cases the grant manager had to advise grantees to refresh their conservation goals and revise the plan accordingly, especially on areas where unexpected catastrophes happened such as in Aceh. Most of the time the grant manager was accompanied by the member of the technical team which provided technical recommendations.	
At least 250 applications were solicited and 71 grants were approved. The grant manager assisted potential grantees on the grant process, circulated amongst the technical team and leading institutions	
for proposal reviews and approvals along with the CEPF support based in headquarters.	
For the local NGOs that weren't able to apply in English, the grant manager assisted in the communication including translations for relevant documents to enable communication flow between CEPF and grantees	
The grant manager met with the lead organizations for proposal reviews, progress updates and field trip coordination among others.	
The grant manager met with the leading organizations and other grantees and encourage discussions among the different parties to share lesson learned on the ground	
The grant manager updated the Regional Vice President on CEPF progress.	
The grant manager called the Asia Grant Director regularly to update progress.	
Written monthly reports on the grant manager activities submitted to Asia Grant Director	
Grant manager submitted articles to CEPF e- newsletters and annual reports	
Grant manager participated in the annual coordination meeting in CEPF Headquarters and participated in the CEPF regional meeting in China	

Director and/or CEPF Asia-based coordination mechanisms.	and the Philippines
Output 4: CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager	
facilitates monitoring & evaluation components	
to enable CEPF to assess impact of its funding	
in the field.	
Grant Manager facilitates M&E tool	M& E tool including the GEF tracking tool was
development and implementation, including	developed
at least two trips to Sumatra by the end of	
FY07	
Grant Manager works with CEPF Advisory	At least 2 Advisory Council meetings were
Council and "Flying Team" in monitoring &	conducted during the implementation of the project
evaluation, resolving conflicts in the field,	period
troubleshooting, and providing policy	
recommendations to decision makers.	
Output 5: CEPF Sumatra Grant Manager assists	
CEPF and relevant grantees in leveraging	
matching funds for CEPF-funded projects.	
Grant Manager investigates potential	The grant manager attended meetings and
leveraging opportunities and, as relevant,	workshops on funding opportunities and informed
pursues them, communicates them to	CEPF and the grantees.
CEPF headquarters, or informs grantees.	

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

At the output level, the grantees (local NGOs) now have more capacity in terms of developing proposals to CEPF and also understood the importance of developing a common conservation vision to achieve conservation success. Additionally, the grantees considered the CEPF grant mechanism to be the best compared to other grant mechanisms.

Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

Most of the output had been delivered, although the grant manager left in December 2006, the responsibility had been taken over by the technical staff.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

Not applicable

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

Not applicable

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

Not applicable

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

^{*}Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:

- A Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)
- **B** Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)
- **C** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)
- **D** Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Iwan Wijayanto
Organization name: Conservation International Indonesia
Mailing address: Jl. Pejaten Barat 16A. Kemang Jakarta 12550 INDONESIA

Tel: +62 21 7883 8624 Fax: +62 21 780 6723

E-mail: iwijayanto@conservation.org