

UN-REDD PROGRAMME



FINAL EVALUATION OF THE UN- REDD PROGRAMME IN INDONESIA



Team Leader: Juan Luis Larrabure
Consultant: Ilya M. Moeliono

Jakarta, October 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABREVIATIONS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
I. CONCEPT AND RELEVANCE.....	8
I.A. General Background to the UN REDD Programme.....	8
I.B. The UN REDD Programme in Indonesia	8
I.C. Joint programme Relevance.....	9
I.D. Joint programme Design Objective and Outcomes	10
I.E. The Evaluation and Its Methodology	10
II. RESULTS AND ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED OBJECTIVES.....	11
II.A. Outcomes and Outputs	11
II. B Overall Assessment	21
II.C. External Factors.....	22
III. SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT.....	24
III.A. Financial Sustainability.....	24
III.B. Institutional Sustainability.....	25
III.C. Socio-Political Sustainability	25
III.D. Environmental Sustainability	25
III.E Impact.....	26
IV. IMPLEMENTATION.....	26
IV.A Budget and Expenditures	26
IV.B Programme Management	27
IV.C. Use of UN-REDD Guidelines and Safeguards.	28
IV.D. Risk Management	29
V. SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNT (CONCLUSIONS) AND RECOMMENDATIONS....	32
ANNEXES	35
ANNEX 1: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED.....	36
ANNEX 2: LIST OF DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED	38
ANNEX 3: THEORY OF CHANGE ANALISYS.....	43
ANNEX 4: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION MISSION.....	46

ABBREVIATIONS

BAPPENAS	<i>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional</i> - National Planning Ministry
BDS	Benefit Distribution System
BPKH	<i>Balai Pemantapan Kawasan Hutan</i> - Regional Office of Forestry Planning
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DA	Demonstration Activities
DKN	<i>Dewan Kehutanan Nasional</i> – National Council on Forestry
DNPI	<i>Dewan Nasional Perubahan Iklim</i> - National Council on Climate Change
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FORDA	Forestry Research and Development Agency
FPIC	Free Prior Informed Consent
GIS	Geographic Information System
IP	Implementing Partner
MoF	Ministry of Forestry
MRV	Monitoring Assessment, Reporting and Verification
<i>MUSRENBANGDES</i>	<i>Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa</i> – Village Development Planning Deliberation Forums
NPD	National Program Director
NFI	National Forest Inventory
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PES	Payment for Environmental Services
PGA	Participatory Governance Assessment
PMU	Programme Management Unit
RAD – GRK	Rencana Daerah Pengurangan Emisi Gas Rumah Kaca - Provincial Emission Reduction of Green House Gasses) Action Plans
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forestry Training Centre
REL	Reference Emission Level
<i>UKP4</i>	<i>Unit Kerja Presiden Bidang Pengawasan dan Pengendalian Pembangunan</i> - Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Management of Development
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UN-REDD	The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
WB/FCPF	World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility,

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Quick Start proposal from Indonesia was approved by the UN-REDD Policy Board on 14 March 2009. The total funding foreseen was USD 5,644,250 of which FAO was to receive and execute activities for USD 1,498,000, the UNDP was to receive and execute activities USD 2,996,000 and UNEP was to receive and execute activities USD 1,150,250. The National Joint Programme (NJP) was formally signed on 23 November 2009 and started operating on 30 March 2010.

The chosen implementation partner for the programme in Indonesia was the Directorate General of Forestry Planning of the Ministry of Forestry (MoF). The MoF appointed the Director of Forest Resources, Inventory and Mapping as the National Program Director (NDP) for UN-REDD Programme. A Programme Management Unit (PMU) was established to coordinate all programme activities and coordinate with other partners such as line Ministries, the Planning Ministry (BAPPENAS), NGOs and others. A National Joint Programme Manager, a Chief Technical Advisor, and 3 Team Leaders were appointed to work in the PMU. Each Team Leader was responsible for one of the expected outcomes of the programme. During its existence, the PMU worked closely with UNDP, UNEP, and FAO in implementing the programme.

The overall objective of the UN-REDD Indonesia was to assist the Government of Indonesia (GoI) in attaining REDD readiness. Under the overall objective, 3 outcomes were expected. Outcome 1 was linked to the policy in the national context. Outcome 2 was related to the activities conducted in the chosen pilot province (Central Sulawesi), while Outcome 3 mainly dealt with empowerment and capacity building.

As the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD) in Indonesia has been finalized, a final evaluation was commissioned to assess its achievements and performance (Please refer to Annex 4 to this report for the ToR of the evaluation). A Team composed of an International and a National Consultant was assembled to complete the evaluation. The field work for this purpose was carried out in late October of 2013. The evaluation included used a methodology described in section - **I.E.** below and included a review of program document and relevant reference materials, the identification and formulation of pertinent evaluation questions, the development of interview guides, and data collection through semi-structured interviews and informal free flowing conversations as well as field visits. The people to be interviewed were purposely selected based both on the recommendations of program staff from among project staff and partners involved in the project, as well as others identified by the mission itself.

As stated in the Joint Programme Document, expected OUTCOME 1 was **“Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level”**. OUTCOME 2 was expected to promote the **“Successful demonstration of establishing REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture”** and OUTCOME 3 was expected to establish a **“Capacity to implement REDD at decentralized levels”**. For each expected

OUTCOME a specific set of expected outputs were designed including expected products and activities the achievement of which are described and analyzed in the main body of the report.

As the report states, if the evaluators were to base their conclusions exclusively on the achievement of the expected OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS, PRODUCTS and ACTIVITIES as originally designed and executed, the project would be found not to have fully achieved its ultimate goal (REDD READINESS). However, the evaluation mission felt that one must put what was achieved in the proper context. A key factor that limited the potential impact of the project was the changing environment in which it operated. Early in the Joint Programme's implementation cycle, the GoI received an offer for substantial funding for REDD + activities (about one billion US\$ or about 200 times the UN REDD allocation) and thus decided to establish a REDD+ Task Force composed of many sectors and persons involved in REDD matters. In effect this Task Force dwarfed the efforts of the UN REDD Readiness Programme. Furthermore, the new Task Force was entrusted with establishing a pilot area in a totally different province and Island. In this addition to these key "game changing" events, the evaluators also point to the following:

- The original financial allocation fell short of what would have been required to meet fully the ultimate goal.
- The time frame allotted to achieve the ultimate goal was, in hindsight unrealistically short.

If one takes into account all these factors, unforeseen at the design stage as well as what was indeed achieved, then the evaluators reach a very different conclusion. That the UN REDD investment, which was relatively modest for the Goal it was intended to be produced (REDD DEINESS), was indeed a worthwhile effort. There was general consensus amongst all parties interviewed, that this Joint Programme had made a very significant contribution to bringing REDD issues to the forefront of the discussion on the future development of Indonesia. Similarly, as the Government's REDD + Task Force admits, when they were created they came from many public and private sector backgrounds and the work and support of the UN REDD PMU was key to their efficient and rapid understanding of REDD issues and their ability to deal effectively with those issues,

In fact, the evaluation mission was able to confirm that the draft National REDD + Strategy developed by the UN REDD PMU, made a significant contribution to the final REDD + Strategy designed by the TASK FORCE. Similarly the provincial REDD + Strategy for Central Sulawesi as designed with the assistance of the UN REDD Joint Programme remains valid and in place.

The evaluation mission did reach a series of Conclusions and make 6 recommendations that are geared towards improving both the REDD + future environment in Indonesia as well as to improve the design of future UN REDD activities worldwide. These are:

- *The evaluation mission feels that the UN-REDD programme for Indonesia was very relevant in its content and in its timing.*
- *The evaluation mission feels that the results in relation to the amount invested were well worth the effort.*

- *The choice of implementing partner for the execution of the UN-REDD joint programme, while logical at the time, became problematic when new elements came to bear (a very large sum made available for future REDD+ activities).*
- *Financing REDD readiness programmes make more sense if a REDD+ programme will be immediately available upon completion of the “readiness phase.”*
- *Surrounding Communities can only be expected to change their behavior from being a cause of forest degradation and depletion to behaving as “forest wardens” if they get direct and indirect benefits which they can directly link to forest conservation. Secure land-tenure and/or assurance of rights to forest products is a main motivation for communities to be willing to invest their time and effort in long-term endeavors, and for REDD+ initiatives to be sustainable the projects or programmes need to deal with this issue.*
- *Financial sustainability will depend on the government (at the national and/or provincial level) or external sources, providing funding for REDD + activities.*
- *As a result of the UN-REDD joint programme and other parallel efforts, the conditions for long-term institutional sustainability for a REDD+ environment seem to be present.*
- *The current understanding and commitment of the population to REDD+ values seems to be adequate. Keeping up the message and the momentum in the next few years will be crucial to its consolidation.*
- *The UN-REDD joint programme, and even with all the negative external factors it was confronted with, has indeed made an important contribution towards the success of a future REDD+ programme. However, this potential contribution depends on how well the Programme’s achievements can be maintained in the period between the present and the time actual REDD+ initiatives can be realized.*
- *The evaluation mission judges that the funding was spent adequately.*
- *The evaluation feels that the choice of the IP partner and the rest of the management structure of the UN-REDD joint programme was the most logical at the time they were conceived and that the resources allocated were relatively well managed.*

Based on those conclusions, the Team makes the following recommendations:

- *In designing any future readiness support programmes, UN-REDD should consider what will be the immediate follow-up.*
- *Pilot forest improvement activities designed to add value that can translate into real income for surrounding communities, should be part and parcel of REDD readiness programmes.*
- *The technical assistance, and capacity building activities should not only include the REDD+ specific aspects (i.e. carbon calculation, REL, MRV, BDS, etc.) but also more general forest management capacities, including the socio-political aspects of multi-stakeholder planning and collaboration.*

- *To ensure inclusion of funding for REDD+ initiatives in the government's budget, to the extent possible, REDD+ planning should be integrated the government's regular planning processes.*
- *The new REDD+ Agency of the GoI should consider including Central Sulawesi as a second pilot province in order to capitalize consolidate the advances that the UN-REDD joint programme has achieved there.*
- *To the extent possible, the achievements of the UN-REDD Programme – the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, the Eastern Indonesia University Network on REDD+, the pool of personnel knowledgeable about the various aspects of REDD+, etc. – should be supported and maintained by the government through its continued engagement and utilization.*

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE UN-REDD PROGRAMME IN INDONESIA

I. CONCEPT AND RELEVANCE

I.A. General Background to the UN REDD Programme

The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD) was officially launched on 24 September 2008 by the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the Prime Minister of Norway Jens Stoltenberg. Its objective is to assist developing countries to build capacity to reduce emissions and to participate in a future REDD+ activities and mechanism. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the UNREDD Programme is coordinated by three UN agencies: the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP). The UNREDD Programme also works in close cooperation with the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the Global Environment, and Australia's International Forest Carbon Initiative.

The Government of Norway provided start-up financing for the UN-REDD Programme through a contribution of USD 35 million as part of Norway's International Climate and Forest Initiative, which was announced during the UNFCCC conference at Bali in 2007. In 2009, Denmark also became a donor to the Programme followed by Spain in 2010.

Following its launch nine countries have expressed formal interest in receiving assistance through the UN-REDD Programme. They were Bolivia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Indonesia, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zambia. The demand for UN-REDD support has increased rapidly. Twenty new countries have applied and the programme now has 48 partner countries

A 'Quick Start' phase was initiated in partnership with the nine pilot countries. 'Quick Start' is support programmes developed in cooperation with the nine pilot countries and any other additional pilot National Programmes approved by the Policy Board before 2011. This support has been helping pilot countries to launch a variety of REDD+ readiness activities including development of national REDD+ strategies. These programmes are designed to last about 18-24 months. Indonesia submitted the 'Quick Start' proposal to UN-REDD in February 2009.

I.B. The UN REDD Programme in Indonesia

A Quick Start proposal from Indonesia was approved by the UN-REDD Policy Board on 14 March 2009. The total funding foreseen was USD 5,644,250 of which FAO was to receive and execute activities for USD 1,498,000, the UNDP was to receive and execute activities USD 2,996,000 and UNEP was to receive and execute activities USD 1,150,250. The National Joint Programme (NJP)

was formally signed on 23 November 2009 and on 30 March 2010 the UN-REDD programme was started with an Inception Workshop held at the Gran Melia Hotel in Jakarta. The workshop was followed up through an internal discussion meeting held on 31 March to review the first Annual Workplan.

The chosen implementation partner for the programme in Indonesia was the Directorate General of Forestry Planning of the Ministry of Forestry (MoF). The MoF appointed the Director of Forest Resources, Inventory and Mapping as the National Program Director (NDP) for UN-REDD Programme. A Programme Management Unit (PMU) was established to coordinate all programme activities and coordinate with other partners such as line Ministeries, the Planning Ministry (BAPPENAS), NGOs and others. A National Joint Programme Manager, a Chief Technical Advisor, and 3 Team Leaders were appointed to work in the PMU. Each Team Leader was responsible for one of the three outcomes of the programme. The PMU worked closely with UNDP, UNEP, and FAO in implementing the programme.

I.C. Joint programme Relevance

Indonesia is composed of over 17 thousand Islands totaling an area of approximately 1,9 million square kilometers of which over 990,000 square kilometers or 52.13 % of the total area is forested land. This ranks Indonesia as the eighth most forested country in the world and third if one refers exclusively to tropical forests. It is one of the countries with higher bio-diversity in the world.

The country has a population of about 250 million people and a population density of 132 inhabitants per square kilometer. Of these, approximately 137 million persons or 55% of the population still lives in rural areas. As such, population pressure on forested land is quite high. According to some estimates, in the decade and a half that went from 1990 to 2005 the country may have lost up to 24% of its primary forests which ranks it amongst the top countries in this indicator.

The two main reasons for this state of affairs were the issuance of excessive timber concessions and the clearance of primary forests for agricultural and industrial purposes (mainly for the production of Palm Oil and Cocoa, fast growing timber for pulp and paper and mining).

Since 2005, the GoI, realizing that at these rates of deforestation the country would face a very serious crisis, that such a state of affairs went in direct contradiction to the commitments that the country was making in international forums and that to attract the external financing that the country needed to accelerate its development process, took the decision to confront the problem head on. Since then, the President himself has committed the country to a reduction of a minimum of 26% in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 using its own funds (and up to 41 % if sufficient international support comes forth).

➤ ***IN CONCLUSION: Given this, the evaluation mission feels that the UN REDD programme for Indonesia was very relevant in its content and in its timing.***

I.D. Joint programme Design Objective and Outcomes

The overall objective of the UN-REDD Indonesia was to assist the Government of Indonesia (GoI) in attaining REDD readiness. Under the overall objective, 3 outcomes were expected. Outcome 1 was linked to the policy in the national context, Outcome 2 is related to the activities conducted in the pilot province, while Outcome 3 mainly deals with empowerment and capacity building. Each Outcome is related to the production of 3 or 4 outputs that the activities undertaken by the Programme are to produce. The responsibility to supervise the production of each output was assigned to a particular UN agency involved in the programme based on their mandate and technical capacity to provide technical support to the PMU in the production of that output. Table 1 below shows that division of labour amongst the various UN agencies.

TABLE 1 - OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOME OF THE UN-REDD PROGRAMME INDONESIA

<p>Overall Objective: To Assist The GOI In Attaining REDD-Readiness</p> <p>Outcome 1: Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national level Output 1.1 (UNDP): Consensus on key issues for national REDD policy development Output 1.2 (UNDP): REDD lessons learned Output 1.3 (UNEP): Communications Program</p> <p>Outcome 2: Demonstration of a REL, MARV and fair payment systems based on national REDD architecture Output 2.1 (FAO) Improved capacity and methodology design for forest carbon inventory within a MARV system, including a sub-national pilot implementation Output 2.2 (FAO) Reference emissions level (REL) Output 2.3 (UNDP) Harmonized fair and equitable payment mechanism at provincial level Output 2.4 (UNEP): Toolkit for priority setting towards maximizing potential carbon-benefits and incorporating co-benefits , such as biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation under MDG goals</p> <p>Outcome 3: Capacity established to implement REDD at decentralized levels Output 3.1 (UNDP) Capacity for spatial socio-economic planning incorporating REDD at the district level Output 3.2 (UNDP) Empowered local stakeholders are able to benefit from REDD Output 3.3 (UNDP) Multi-stakeholder-endorsed District plans for REDD implementation</p>
--

I.E. The Evaluation and Its Methodology

As the United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD) in Indonesia has been finalized, a final evaluation was commissioned to assess its achievements and performance (See Annex 4 for the ToR of the evaluation).

The evaluation methodology employed by the team was a mixture of a “logical framework analysis” and a “most significant changes” approach. The first was designed to measure its achievement as stated in the objectives of the Joint Programme Document and the second to

determine what additional unforeseen outcomes might have been produced and what changes they might have induced. The evaluation included a review of program documents and relevant reference materials, the identification and formulation of pertinent evaluation questions, the development of interview guides, and data collection through semi-structured interviews and informal free flowing conversations. The people to be interviewed were purposely selected based both on the recommendations of program staff from among project staff and partners involved in the project as well as others identified by the mission itself.

II. RESULTS AND ACHIEVEMENT OF STATED OBJECTIVES

II.A. Outcomes and Outputs

In terms of expected outcomes outputs, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the joint programme produced both in quality and quantity, most but not all of what was foreseen in its design.

The joint programme's first outcome (**OUTCOME 1**) was to **“Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level”**

To achieve this outcome three major sets of outputs were foreseen. With regards to Output 1.1. which was designed to achieve **“Consensus on key issues for national REDD Policy development”**. Having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were more than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. Some of the major ones were:

1. The establishment of a PMU/Secretariat to support day-to-day operations
2. The production by the PMU with the assistance of other partners of a series of strategic policy initiatives like:
 - A. A Draft National REDD + Strategy
 - B. A Provincial REDD+ Implementation Strategy for Central Sulawesi (pilot province).
 - C. Safeguards (FPIC principles in REDD+ national strategy and policy, Central Sulawesi Governor decrees on FPIC requirements on any REDD+ joint programmes, gender principles in national REDD+ safeguards).
 - D. Institution (facilitated early works of REDD+ Task Force, established multi-stakeholders Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group¹¹ (Jul-Oct 2012)).
 - E. Roadmap development on Forestry MRV, Forestry Industry-based, and Benefit Distribution System.
 - F. Advisory notes on capacity building and communication.
3. UN-REDD Training Syllabus which was adopted by the Centre for Forestry Training for REDD+ Training programme.
4. Over 125 nationwide multi-stakeholder consultations in developing key policy issues were conducted.

5. Coordinated meetings with relevant stakeholders for transfer process and further development of REDD+ strategy and action plans were done in preparation of the closing period of UN-REDD (Jul-Aug 2012).

Output 1.2. was designed to achieve **“the dissemination of “REDD lessons learned”**. Having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is again of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were more than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. Some of the major ones were:

1. Shared concept and ideas on REDD+ through joint workshops with:
 - A. National Council on Forestry (DKN) on FPIC for REDD+ national policy.
 - B. The 2nd Regional UN-REDD Information Exchange Meeting on “Free, Prior and Informed Consent”
 - C. Centre of Standardization and Environment on REDD+ Demonstration Activities Status.
 - D. Indonesia IPs Alliance on gender safeguards and IP.
 - E. Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA) on research Study on REDD+, Payment Mechanism and Benefit Distribution System.
 - F. Report of the Bogor Institute of Agriculture on Forestry MRV Roadmap.
 - G. National Council on Climate Change (DNPI) on Indonesia Carbon Update, 1st Asia Carbon Update, and Geopolitical Map on REDD+.
 - H. Anshor on REDD+ Shared Vision Religious Leaders in Central Sulawesi.
 - I. Produced with the Indonesia Center for Environmental Law (ICEL) a document ~~on~~ entitled Toward Climate Justice: “Improving Governance, Legal Framework and Liability Aspects of Climate Change in Indonesia”.
 - J. M. Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group on various workshops and FGDs at Central Sulawesi; various topics related with REDD+.
2. Prepared & disseminated Lessons- Learned materials through various means & events:
 - A. Criteria on how to select Pilot Province for the implementation of REDD+.
 - B. UN-REDD multi-stakeholder consultation processes.
 - C. Workshop proceedings on progress of REDD+ related Demonstration activities in Indonesia.
 - D. 10 ‘fact sheets’ were produced on national REDD+ strategy.
 - E. Presentation on National Forest Monitoring System (national and sub national in UNFCCC Doha Side event.

With regards to Output 1.3. which was designed to **“Ensure that a communication programme in support of REDD was in place”** after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stakeholders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were less than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. The shortcomings in this regard, as identified by the mission were:

- The communication strategy was designed well into the joint programme’s execution and the evaluation mission was told that at the time there was no communications officer within the PMU. Apparently UN REDD was unsuccessful in finding a capable replacement for the communications officer who left mid way into the Joint programme.
- Some of the publications were positioned more as tools for public relations and image building, and rather less than tools for knowledge sharing. i.e., the design of the banners, brochures, and posters seem to be more directed at promotion of the Programme rather than at information sharing among the stakeholders. One key person involved in the Programme stated that the communication activities were “piecemeal...many activities happened only once and were not followed up”; this was similar to the observations of the consultant hired to map out the strategy who felt that many of the activities were “more tactical and not strategic.”
- The broader concept of knowledge management; that is to say the management of the communication flow among all stakeholders, the documentation and sharing of cases and lessons learned seemed to have been somewhat weak. Some of these activities were done but apparently not in a systematic way.

However, for the production of Output 1.3 a series of activities and were carried out and several products produced amongst which were:

1. Recruited a Communication Officer
2. Developed a communication strategy on UN-REDD.
3. An advisory note for public communication was shared to REDD+ Task Force, DNPI, MoFor and workshop participants.
4. A REDD+ Training Profile was prepared
5. A list of target groups for communicating REDD+ issues was identified.
6. Established and regularly updated UN-REDD Website (<http://un-redd.or.id/>) which also has an inbuilt simple monitoring systems to track site visits.
7. Published and distributed relevant materials for public via various events (all communications products have been collated in a catalogue and is available on a CD.
8. Film documentation of FPIC trial process.
9. Study on gender and REDD+ was completed, and its results have been used by the REDD+ Task Force to develop the gender elements of its social safeguards.

The joint programme’s second outcome, (OUTCOME 2) **was designed to promote the “Successful demonstration of establishing REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture”**

To achieve this outcome four major outputs were foreseen. With regards to Output 2.1. which was designed to achieve to improve the **“Capacity and methodology design for forest carbon inventory within a Monitoring Assessment, Reporting and Verification Systems (MRV), including sub-national pilot implementation”** after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is

again of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. Some of the major ones were:

1. Study of land use classification based on Spot 4 image for Central Sulawesi.
2. Re-designed NFI's sampling method based on stakeholder consultations.
3. Recommendation on National REDD+ Information, Monitoring & MRV Action Plan prepared and submitted to the REDD+ Task Force and other government institutions.
4. Draft of Forestry MRV Roadmap was initiated and developed through collaborative activities with the Ministry of Forestry (since Apr 2011).
5. MRV principles were published and disseminated to relevant stakeholders.
6. Enhanced capacity in basic remote sensing of 63 stakeholders in Central Sulawesi representing provincial government agencies, NGOs, CSOs, and Universities.
7. Enhanced capacities of Ministry of Forestry staff on options for re-designing the NFI through a NFI study trip to FAO Headquarters.
8. Developed syllabus for basic Remote Sensing training .
9. Developed syllabus for field measurement inventory training.
10. Developed a specialized data management system for Indonesia's NFI data – Open Foris and installed it in 18 computers at MoFor
11. Enhanced capacity of 4 MoFor staffs in Jakarta and 14 MoFor staff in the provinces in the use of Open Foris.
12. Enhanced knowledge of MoFor staffs in the allometric equation by participating in a training in Viet Nam and a follow-up workshop in Indonesia.
13. Developed protocol/guidelines for field implementation of carbon inventory.
14. Collected field data measurement from 35 plots in Central Sulawesi.
15. Soil Data analysis sampled from the 35 plots based on the UNTAD Laboratory analysis.
16. Report on Policy Research on Indonesia's National Forest Inventory prepared.

Output 2.2 referred to the setting of a **“Reference emission level (REL) proposed at the provincial level”** and having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, once again the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were more than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. Some of the major ones were:

1. Made available REL methodological options for Central Sulawesi.
2. Made available steps to calculate REL for Central Sulawesi.
3. Made available syllabus/module for REL training.
4. Relevant stakeholders from 33 provinces were trained on how to calculate REL for their province.
5. Training on the options of method to calculate REL/RL at national level was given.

6. A University Forum on REL methodology at Palu and on UN- REDD Activities Lesson learned. This involved 15 professors from 13 universities at Eastern Indonesia.
7. Identified options to calculate REL for Central Sulawesi.
8. A training on Forestry Baseline was established in coordination with BAPPENAS

In regard to Output 2.3 which referred to the capacity to establish a **“Harmonized fair and equitable payment mechanism at provincial level”** after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were less than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. The main shortcomings in this regard, as identified by the mission were the fact that:

- the Programme did not go beyond studies and did not actually design and establish any payment mechanism. This could be understood, however, as a payment mechanism could only be established in an actual REDD+ environment, in which it is clear who is paying, who should be paid, and what the bases for those payments would be. As this all is not yet clear and still depends on the results of ongoing international UNFCCC negotiations. Establishing a payment mechanism at the provincial level should be consistent with the international mechanism and therefore would also not be possible for this reason. But even if it was clear at the international level, in the opinion of the evaluation mission this would still not be possible in the short time of the UN REDD Programme’s duration.
- Another important issue to be reported here is the fact that a number of stakeholders questioned the appropriateness not only of the payment system but even the appropriateness of the underlying concept of providing financial incentives for conservation. It was mentioned by some key stakeholders at MoF and the Provincial Forest Service in Central Sulawesi that conservation initiatives, including carbon sequestration, should not depend on outside financial incentives, and those incentives when made available should be considered as a “bonus”. While it was admitted that financial incentives might indeed be an effective motivation to bolster forest conservation initiatives, it was considered that to involve stakeholders in the development of a payment mechanism at this time would be inappropriate as it might unrealistic expectations and would become problematic and even counter-productive if those expectations could not be met. The Evaluation Mission fully agrees with this and while noticing that the intended Output has not been achieved appreciates the reasons.

For the production of this output a series of activities were carried out and products produced amongst which were:

1. Initial analysis on the compiled information that shows benefits and constraints of existing PES projects and the implications of REDD+.
2. Compiled funding and fiscal transfer systems that currently exist in Indonesia.
3. Lessons learned from mapping existing funding systems, payment mechanisms and benefit distribution systems in Indonesia and internationally.

4. Coordination meeting on potential collaboration in developing a road map of payment mechanism with UN-REDD, REDD+ Task Force, and WB/FCPF.
5. Submitted BDS system roadmap to REDD+ Task Force.
6. Capacitated relevant stakeholders on BDS options for Central Sulawesi through a Workshop.

In respect of Output 2.4 the creation of a **“Toolkit for priority setting towards maximizing potential carbon-benefits and incorporating co-benefits, at the provincial level”** after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were adequate.

For the production of this output a series of activities and were carried out and products produced amongst which were:

1. Enhanced knowledge of four Indonesian colleagues from MoFor, Regional Office of Forestry Planning (BPKH) Palu, Central Sulawesi Forest Service and Tadulako University on the purpose and practical application of a co-benefit tool kit for REDD+ planning.
2. Finalized the elements of the priority setting toolkit on multiple benefits, including the analysis of legal and policy frameworks relevant to land use related aspects of REDD+ implementation in Central Sulawesi.
3. Developed the following products:
 - A. A brochure intended for stakeholders at province and district level explaining the potential impacts of different kinds of REDD+ implementation actions on multiple benefits;
 - B. a compendium of maps that can be used for planning different kinds of REDD+ implementation actions in a manner that promotes multiple benefits, with an explanation on how each of the maps can be used;
 - C. a guide to existing decision-support tools that can be helpful in planning for multiple benefits from REDD+;
 - D. a cross-sectoral review of policy and legislative frameworks that are relevant to REDD+ implementation in Central Sulawesi, with specific attention to policies and legal regulations related to land use; and
 - E. a Syllabus and tool-kit for trainings.
4. Enhanced knowledge and skill of 11 district staff on the GIS issue and its implementation for land base planning.
5. Enhanced knowledge and skill of 11 district government staff and 14 province government staff on the use of multiple benefit toolkit.
6. Enhanced knowledge of national stakeholders on the REDD+ co-benefit toolkits after the REDD

The last outcome of the joint programme (**OUTCOME 3**) which was to establish a **“Capacity established to implement REDD at decentralized levels”** To achieve this outcome three outputs were foreseen.

With regards to Output 3.1 the establishment of a **“Capacity for spatial socio-economic planning incorporating”** after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were in general adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. However, the evaluation mission wishes to express its doubt that the provincial REDD+ Working Group (Central Sulawesi) really constitutes institutional development (i.e. capacity creation) as it is an ad-hoc temporary group and is presently slowly tending towards its dissolution for lack of viable REDD+ activities in the field, A similar concern refers to the REDD+ network of universities which after only one meeting cannot be said to have been really consolidated.

Some of the major activities carried out and products produced in respect of Output 3.1 were:

1. Promoted understanding on the issues of climate change, REDD+, and UN-REDD for the District forestry office.
2. Developed criteria to assess the districts potentially for REDD+ DAs.
3. Comprehensive data for all districts (11 districts) have been collected and compiled.
4. Governor’s decree on 5 selected districts prioritized for REDD+ DAs.
5. Enhanced MoFor staff on opportunity cost analyses for REDD+ after attending a training on opportunity costs analysis in Bangkok.
6. Study result of Opportunity costs of major land uses in Central Sulawesi have been analyzed.
7. Study result of socio-economic impact of REDD+ planning in the Central Sulawesi.
8. Available Forest Carbon Statistic of Central Sulawesi 1990 – 2011.

With regards to Output 3.2 the establishment of a **“Empowered local stakeholders are able to benefit from REDD”** after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stakeholders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the activities carried out and the products produced were less than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. While the Programme conducted many REDD-readiness activities with good results as indicated above and below, for a successful REDD+ joint programme there are many more requirements to be fulfilled by the stakeholders other than the capabilities which were the focus of the Programme, among others these are:

- The ability of agencies and communities in large areas of forests (large enough to be significant in terms of reducing carbon emissions) to effectively cooperate in the planning and management of those forests in the framework of REDD+ arrangements. This would include not only the technical knowledge and skills, as introduced by the Programme, but also political and social skills for area-wide collaborative planning and organizational skills for coordinated implementation.
- The ability to access REDD+ incentive schemes and to negotiate the terms of participating in those schemes.

By design and considering its relative short duration, the Programme’s REDD+ readiness activities did not address in a significant manner those wider management and networking skills and only

reached the national and provincial level stakeholders, but not the district level and communities. Also the Programme did not include actual REDD+ initiatives as yet. For these reasons, quite understandably, the stakeholders' ability to benefit from REDD+ could not be proven.

Some of the major activities carried out and products for this output were:

1. Established REDD Working Group and sub-working groups in Central Sulawesi.
2. In regard of capacity development the joint programme:
 - A. Increased Working Group members' understanding on REDD+ issues.
 - B. Enhanced capacity of the members of Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Groups after participating at Training of Trainers organized by Conservation International (CI) and University of Indonesia on Climate Change and REDD+.
 - C. Supported participation of Central Sulawesi journalists in the training on the issues of climate change, REDD+ and FPIC at Jakarta.
 - D. Results of initial scoping mission for capacity need assessment for Central Sulawesi.
 - E. REDD+ Training Profile (in collaboration with Pusdiklat Kehutanan-Mofor).
 - F. Report on need assessment at district level workshop.
 - G. A document on assessment report and proposal for capacity building of REDD+ in central Sulawesi.
3. Enhanced some key persons at participating villages for FPIC trials on climate change, REDD+, and issues of rehabilitation projects in their area after participating in FPIC Facilitator Training.
4. Disseminated information on climate change and REDD+ issues to Central Sulawesi
5. REDD+ Working Group and to district governments.
6. Central Sulawesi Media Gathering to promote the understanding of REDD+, climate change issues and the UN-REDD Programme.
7. Institutional mapping for REDD+ knowledge and learning facility report.
8. Facilitated participants in the ASFN Conference on Social Forestry and community engagement in Jakarta and Bangkok.
9. Enhanced experience of Central Sulawesi Government officials in Durban COP 17 Side Event.
10. Increased role of local stakeholder at international event by participating in regional discussion on post-Cancun organized by RECOFTC and FAO in Chiang Mai (Thailand).
11. Report on institutional mapping on REDD+ knowledge and learning facility at Central Sulawesi

Lastly, with regards to Output 3.3 the drafting of "Multi-stakeholder endorsed District Plans for REDD implementation," after having reviewed the documentation and questioned concerned staff, partners, other stake holders and observers, the evaluation mission is of the opinion that the

activities carried out and the products produced were less than adequate both in their quality, quantity and coverage. The main shortcomings in this regard, as identified by the mission were:

- The understanding of FPIC should not be limited to the final steps of formalizing a consensus within a single community and of the community with outside agencies, but also the efforts to develop the prerequisites necessary to reach well informed multi-stakeholder agreements. This would need to include a lengthy process of community engagement through participatory research, planning, and decision making.
- The “informed” part of FPIC should not be understood as merely providing information on a proposed project. To really provide informed consent, community members need not only to understand the program proposed, but also make an informed judgment about its application within the local context and all possible impacts. For this, the communities should also be helped to understand their own context – as many times their knowledge is limited to their immediate environment only. Larger environmental issues which go beyond peoples’ current knowledge and experience should be fully explained (i.e. global warming and climate change, impact on the interests of other villages in their areas well as the interests of the whole nation) should also be understood. This cannot be achieved in 3 or 4 day training sessions. To develop this knowledge a more lengthy learning process based on the principles of participatory action research is required.
- While it is understood that FPIC trials were designed to test the provincial FPIC Guidelines, and not only to obtain consent or rejection on the particular program, it is exactly because those trials were not realistic that the results regarding the proposed methodology are not really conclusive, especially in the context of REDD+.
- The evaluation mission found that many stakeholders saw FPIC as a process by which the “indigenous communities” could have VETO POWER over what could and could not take place within their area of influence. While FPIC should be a process that: (1) fully includes concerned communities in the analysis of the foreseen impact that a particular activity or set of activities may have on their lives; (2) implies that the authorities must carry out every effort to reach consensus on an approach; (3) and fully involves the community’s legitimate representatives in the decision making process, FPIC should not be seen as providing a total VETO POWER. The narrow understanding of FPIC giving local communities total veto power over proposed government projects needs to be rectified. The interests of adjacent communities, communities in the same ecosystem such as watersheds or protected areas, and the rights and interests of national majorities must also be protected by the process. FPIC was designed as a process to protect small minorities from abuse, but not to disenfranchise the legitimate rights of the nation.
- While the evaluation team judges the decision not to test the FPIC methodology on actual REDD initiatives as not to create unrealistic expectations very appropriate given the current situation regarding REDD+ and acknowledges that the FPIC activities were a positive learning experience for the community members involved, a critical analysis of appropriateness and efficacy the FPIC methodology, especially as it relates to REDD is still needed.

- Integrating FPIC in established planning government procedures is in the opinion of the mission a must. The government – Bappenas and the Ministry of Home Affairs – have established a national planning mechanisms. The REDD+ Strategy and the RAD – GRK (Emission Reduction of Green House Gasses) action plans are (in the process of being) integrated into the provincial strategic plans – the same could be done at the community level . Village planning is supposed to be carried out through *Musrenbangdes* (*Musyawah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa* – Village Development Planning Deliberation Forums) – If the *Musrenbangdes* is carried out well (i.e. in a participatory way manner) FPIC for REDD+ should be an integral part of this planning process.
- While methodological guidelines are necessary and the basic principles of FPIC should be upheld, it is the opinion of the evaluation mission that the application of the methods should be flexible depending on the specific context. It must be possible to adjust the actual methods and techniques for FPIC as well as the duration of the process itself and the previous training to be provided, to the specific context and community characteristics.

Some of the major activities and products that resulted from the joint programme were:

1. A set of criteria to select pilot districts is established.
2. Five UN-REDD pilot districts were selected, i.e. Sigi, Donggala, Parigi Moutong, Toli-Toli, and Tojo Una-Una.
3. A set of guidelines on FPIC implementation was established.
4. Locations for FPIC Pilot activities (KPH Dampelas Tinombo and Lore Lindu National Park located in Donggala, Sigi and Parigi districts) were selected.
5. Agreed subject of FPIC pilot on Forest Rehabilitation.
6. Available materials for FPIC pilot activities in selected districts.
7. Involvement of stakeholders in the consultation of the establishment of the Central Sulawesi Working Group and inauguration.
8. Training for Trainer for FPIC facilitators to implement piloting FPIC.
9. Report of Piloting of the Implementation of FPIC guideline for the Dampelas Tinombo Forest Management Unit's forest rehabilitation programme in Lembah Mukti Village (Mar 2012).
10. FPIC verification was conducted.
11. Trained potential independent evaluators in the FPIC evaluation methodology).
12. Adopted UN-REDD products by Province Government indicated by the issuance of Governor Decrees as follow:
 - A. Selected 5 Districts as Demonstration Activities for REDD+.
 - B. REDD+ Strategy.
 - C. Provisional REL.

- D. RAD-GRK.
- E. FPIC implementation.
- F. A document about recommendation of REDD+ Plan for Central Sulawesi

NOTE: The outputs listed above are but the main ones produced by the joint programme. For a complete list of outputs the reader can refer to the matrix contained in the Joint Programme`s Final Report available at the UNDP MPTF Gateway - <http://mptf.undp.org/document/search> and select under COUNTRY “ Indonesia” and under TYPE “ End of Project Report”.

II. B Overall Assessment

In spite of the aforementioned weaknesses which stem mainly from the fact that at the end of the UN REDD joint programme it was not clear who or which agency was to follow-up the effort, it is the opinion of the evaluation mission that the joint programme performed as designed and made a significant contribution to the promotion of the concept of REDD in Indonesia. Without a doubt the joint programme achieved most of what it intended to do in relation to establishing conditions for REDD readiness in Indonesia.

Another factor affecting the program`s achievement of its goals was the rapid evolution of the REDD+ readiness environment in Indonesia, particularly the LOI between the Governments of Indonesia and Norway, which undermined the basis for some originally-designed outputs.

Everywhere the mission went, the general consensus was that UN REDD had been instrumental in clarifying the difficult technical concepts involved in the minds of the various actors and partners. It was also widely asserted that the UN REDD joint programme contributed greatly to creating the climate for and promoting discussion on the need to curb greenhouse gas emissions, rehabilitate degraded forest lands and conserve primary forests.

The mission believes this can be best summarized in the following statement it received:

“ When we were entrusted with the responsibility to start to work on REDD+ and the preparation for the establishment of a REDD+ Agency and we formed the REDD`Task Forc, we did not know much about forestry, forest degradation, or deforestation and its prevention. We relied heavily on the work carried out by the UN REDD project and the advice of the UN REDD PMU to provide us with the technical inputs and knowledge that we required.”

A very senior official of the UKP4 REDD + Task Force

IN CONCLUSION: The evaluation mission feels that the results in relation to the amount invested were well worth the effort.

II.C. External Factors

Having stated the positive contribution the UN REDD made to Indonesia does not mean that there were not problems during the execution of the joint programme that limited its potential impact. Indeed the joint programme faced some major challenges and limitations that resulted in important constraints on its potential impact. The evaluation mission would wish to highlight three very specially:

- Institutional Change

The UN REDD PMU with support from BAPPENAS was intended to be the coordinating unit for program activities amine to lay the foundation and develop methodologies for all future REDD+ activities within Indonesia. However, mid-way through the life of the UN REDD joint programme, the Government decided to create a separate REDD+ TASK FORCE within the President`s office to oversee this process. This resulted in the fact that some of the work carried out by the UN REDD PMU and BAPPENAS was invalidated. The most salient example of this was that the draft National Strategy prepared by these two units and approved by the concerned stakeholders, was only partially used in the elaboration of the of the Final Strategy by the UKP4 REDD+ Task Force. This was reiterated to the evaluation mission by several sources. Amongst these perhaps the most telling can be the following quote when asked by the mission how much of the original strategy he felt had been useful in the elaboration of the final version:

“ ... about 50%.

A technical officier of the UKP4 REDD + Task Force Secretariate

Several explanations were provided to the mission by various sources for only partially using the previous work of UN REDD. The most plausible was that the original strategy was not complete enough and possibly too slanted towards the vision of REDD+ as seen from MoFor, and did not take sufficiently into consideration the broader issues of forest governance and the views of other stakeholders outside the forestry sector.

Similarly, after a detailed selection process had chosen the province of Central Sulawesi for its pilot project area the UKP4 REDD+ Task Force however, chose a different province (Central Kalimantan) on the island of Borneo. This too creates serious problems for the future effectiveness work carried by UN REDD. Creating a REDD+ readiness scenario in Central Sulawesi without having any means to implement REDD+ programmes in the near future may well result in the loss of credibility in the process and the interest of the multiple stakeholders that were sensitized.

Several reasons for UKP4 to have chosen a different province and island for its pilot exercise were provided to the mission. The most quoted was that in Central Kalimantan there were not only primary forests and deforested areas but also peat lands and therefore provided a better testing ground for REDD+ activities.

The fact is that the mission believes that not entrusting the UN REDD PMU with the preparation of future REDD+ activities is due to a few causes:

1. The fact that a very important contribution in support of future REDD+ activities became apparent (up to 1 billion U\$ from the Government of Norway) thus requiring an experienced and proven team of administrators to handle such a large sum of money. (the UKP4 Task Force and its Secretariate was staffed by able administrators who had successfully managed the funds provided by the international community for the reconstruction and rehabilitation efforts after the 2005 Tsunami).
2. The feeling amongst some stakeholders that the UN REDD PMU (staffed mainly by MoFor officials) had a relatively narrow vision for REDD+. In this respect though, the evaluation mission wishes to remind the readers that forest degradation and deforestation is responsible for 80% of greenhouse gas emissions in Indonesia.

➤ ***IN CONCLUSION: The choice of implementing partner for the execution of the UN REDD joint programme, while logical at the time, became problematic when new elements came to bear (a very large sum made available for future REDD + activities).***

- **Timing of phases- Preparing for what?**

Another problem identified by the mission was that of timeliness of the UN REDD joint programme. Preparing Indonesia for REDD is a fine and worthwhile endeavor, but it can only be truly effective if in the end there are REDD+ activities to execute. The fact is that to date, a year after the UN REDD effort closed, there are no REDD+ activities to be executed. This can lead to a discouraging scenario for those partners and stakeholders that have invested their time and their resources in preparing for REDD+ as well as a loss in the skills transferred to them as they are not immediately applied.

➤ ***IN CONCLUSION: Financing REDD readiness programmes make more sense if a REDD+ programme will be immediately available upon completion of the “readiness phase.”***

- **REDD+ Incentives**

The evaluation mission is convinced that one of the potential principal actors in safeguarding forest resources from actions that lead to their degradation or depletion are the surrounding communities. No amount of “policing” or legislative framework will suffice if the communities themselves either find of little value their forest resources, find their livelihood in depleting or degrading them, or are too weak to protect those resources from more powerful outside stakeholders.

REDD+ is seen by many as a scheme dependent on foreign resources, be it through carbon trading direct transfers, or other means of providing incentives for reducing carbon emissions, maintaining or increasing forest carbon. The carbon trading concept as an important source of development financing, as well as the benefit distribution mechanisms are still very much up in the air and even if it did come into its own as envisioned, it is doubtful, in the opinion of the evaluation mission, that

its benefits would ever reach small communities in a way that would link in the minds of people, the protection of the forest with communal development.

The same can be said of direct transfers (be it large government to government transfers, debt-for-nature swaps, local PES arrangements or other similar schemes). The money will be administered by the government bureaucracy (at its various levels) and while benefits may accrue locally (roads, schools, health centers) the evaluation mission believes that, in the minds of the surrounding community members, these products will not be directly linked to forest conservation as they will be seen as services the government should provide anyway.

In the opinion of the evaluation mission, communities can only be expected to act as “forest wardens” if the forest itself provides them with direct financial benefits. Therefore, it is important that both primary and degraded forests be a direct source of income to the surrounding communities. This can be achieved through the production and harvesting of existing forest related products (water rights, honey, nuts, etc) but also through improved forest management through the promotion of activities such as eco-tourism or through forest improvement through the introduction of products which are either carbon neutral or actually increase carbon sequestration while preserving the eco-system, such as adding to the stock of existing forest products, other products such as vanilla, medicinal plants, rattan and many others.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: Surrounding Communities can only be expected to change their behavior from being an cause of forest degradation and depletion to behaving as “forest wardens” if they get direct and indirect benefits which they can directly link to forest conservation.***

III. SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT

III.A. Financial Sustainability

The financial sustainability of the achievements of the UN REDD joint programme over the next few years will depend heavily on REDD+ activities being started in Central Sulawesi, be they with government funds or those coming from external sources. In this respect, the evaluation made a plea to the senior staff of the UKP4-REDD+ Task Force and to the Norwegian Embassy staff concerned to consider the possibility of providing some basic funding for such activities in that province.

Obviously another option to be considered is to seek funding from other external sources or develop collaboration with one of the more than 40 REDD+ initiatives in the country.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: Financial sustainability of the activities initiated by UN-REDD will depend on the government (at the national and/or provincial level) or external sources, providing funding for REDD + activities.***

III.B. Institutional Sustainability

As stated previously the evaluation mission was impressed by the high level of commitment towards creating a very conducive REDD+ environment by all parties concerned. At the central level both the UKP4-REDD+ Task Force as well as MoFor, the Ministry of the Environment and BAPPENAS clearly showed this commitment. The great unknown is what will be the capacity (technical, legal and financial) of the newly proposed Indonesian REDD+ Agency) and who will be chosen to lead it.

Another unknown factor is that Presidential elections are due in April 2014 and while the current administration has shown great commitment to environmental sustainability, it obviously remains to be seen if a new President and administration will be likewise committed. The evaluation mission though feels that one can be quite optimistic in this respect, as the link between sustainable development, health, future welfare, the attraction of foreign investment and employment opportunities seem to be pervasive in the minds of everyone it interviewed and talked to. This in no small amount can be attributed to the UN REDD effort.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: As a result of the UN REDD joint programme and other parallel efforts, the conditions for long term institutional sustainability for a REDD+ environment seem to be present.***

III.C. Socio-Political Sustainability

Again, the UN REDD joint programme, and it must be said many other parallel efforts carried out by the GoI and the International Community, have made a significant contribution toward the development of an understanding of the necessity for forest conservation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions as well as the advantages that such policies translate to in the quality of their daily lives among the population of Indonesia.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: The current development of understanding and commitment of the population to REDD+ values seems to be on the right track. Keeping up the message and the momentum in the next few years will be crucial to its consolidation.***

III.D. Environmental Sustainability

The concept of REDD+ is to stimulate and strengthen the country's and the people's commitment toward conservation and prudent forest management and it is expected that the implementation of REDD+ initiatives will contribute toward the reduction of GHG emissions and environmental sustainability in general. However, to what extent the current Programme has contributed toward environmental sustainability cannot be measured at this time; the UN-REDD Programme for Indonesia has been a "readiness" program" and with the exception of the limited FPIC trials in Central Sulawesi no actual field programs have been planned and implemented as of yet. The link between the impact of the UN REDD joint programme and the long term effect of a REDD+ programme cannot therefore yet be evaluated.

III.E Impact

While, the long term contribution to Indonesia's environmental sustainability cannot yet be measured as stated above, in terms of creating a REDD+ readiness environment, the UN REDD joint programme has, for the most part, achieved its outcomes. It has also made a significant contribution towards generating a dialogue on the importance of forest conservation and rehabilitation and on the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It has successfully proven many of the tools it helped to develop in a pilot project area. It has created structures at the provincial level that have brought together many stakeholders creating a showcase of how they can work together in support of REDD in a manner that benefits each of them and society as a whole.

The impact however could have been much larger if the limitations explained in point **II.C External Factors** above, especially if the timing of the project had been such that the "readiness phase" had been followed up immediately by a "REDD+ implementation phase.". Similarly, if Central Sulawesi had also been chosen as a pilot area by the current REDD+ Task Force.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: The UN REDD joint programme, for its size and scope and even with all the negative external factors it was confronted with, has indeed made an important contribution towards the success of a future REDD+ programme.***

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

IV.A Budget and Expenditures

The joint programme was originally budgeted at US \$ 5,644,250 and actual expenditures were US \$ 5,205,604. This means an expenditures to budget ratio of 92 % which the evaluation mission feels is well within acceptable levels. The mission tried to get information to be able to pronounce itself further on efficiency issues (such as figures that would allow it to determine unit costs for training and carry out some comparisons) but was unable to secure it in the form they desired.

However, given,

- the relatively small amount of the total investment on the joint programme itself,
- the fact that it had a myriad of activities both in Jakarta, Central Sulawesi and other places in Indonesia such as 222 events hosted, 72 meetings on different topics organized, a series of exhibits executed,
- the clear perception by the mission of the effectiveness of these activities as designed

the mission feels that the funding provided was well spent.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: The evaluation mission judges that the funding was spent adequately and gave Indonesia good "value for money" results.***

IV.B Programme Management

Early on into the conception of the UN REDD joint programme, MoFor was chosen as the implementing partner. The Programme had a complex management structure. At the apex were: the Government of Indonesia represented by MoFor and BAPPENAS and the UN represented by two of its programmes (UNDP, UNEP) and one UN specialized agency (FAO). Of these, only one had a fully staffed representation within Indonesia (UNDP). In joint consultation they decided to establish a Programme Management Unit (PMU).

MoFor senior cadres were chosen to head the PMU (National Programme Director, Deputy National Programme Director and a Programme Manager) came from senior MoFor ranks as did some mid-level technical staff. This had the advantage of ensuring that the Programme staff were, from its inception, familiar with the complex issues related, the national forestry context and its complexities, the state of international negotiations on issues such as greenhouse gas emissions and of course familiar with the workings of the national bureaucracy at its various levels. However, the Programme staff was not familiar with the complex issues related to REDD, but this could indeed not have been expected in 2009 and 2010 when the basic concepts of REDD were still at the development stage. Furthermore, it also had its disadvantages such as tying to the vision of one Ministry which was perceived by other public and private entities as having been in the past the main culprit for the current “state of affairs” as they were in charge of granting logging concessions etc. and had done so in a manner that were perceived by many as less transparent than desirable.

In order to try and minimize this fear as well as to ensure appropriate coordination amongst the potential stakeholders, a UN REDD working group with ample representation was established. This group was consulted periodically.

The day to day work of the PMU was carried out through a series of partners at the national and provincial (Central Sulawesi) levels. Amongst them one could mention the National Council on Climate Change, NGOs such as AMAN which represents the indigenous peoples of Indonesia and Yayasan Merah Putih, the Provincial Government of Central Sulawesi (whose Governor was very committed to the aims of the UN REDD joint programme), the University of Tadulako, the Lore Lindu National Park, private sector entities such as PT. Eco-green Resources, PT. Balantak Rimba Rejeki, and the Central Sulawesi Branch of the Association of Forest Businesses (APHI), and many others.

All efforts were made to use consultants and institutions of recognized excellence to produce reports, carry out training and support the design of systems, guidelines and norms. The evaluation mission wishes to express its recognition that with some exceptions

qualified national expertise was used in the majority of cases, resorting to international expertise when they provided clear comparative advantages. This not only resulted in improved products as the work was carried out with a full understanding of the local context, culture and language as well

as in a better use of the available financial resources, but more importantly created “ownership” of the joint programme’s results within Indonesia.

While there was some movement of responsible staff over time (per example: the mission noted that within UNDP three different officers had been put in charge of monitoring this joint programme in the two and a half years of its execution), these movements did not seem to have any negative effect on the joint programme itself.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: The evaluation feels that the choice of the IP partner and the rest of the management structure of the UN REDD joint programme was the most logical at the time they were conceived and that the resources allocated were relatively well managed.***

IV.C. Use of UN-REDD Guidelines and Safeguards.

In terms of safeguards, the Programme has included gender considerations in the draft National REDD+ strategy and conceptualized guidelines for FPIC and gender equality. The Programme also commissioned consultants to draft preparatory concept notes on the integration of gender in REDD+ initiatives.

As at the present time no actual REDD+ activities have been implemented, therefore no statements can be made about the implementation of gender safeguards in the Programme. It is of course expected that those guidelines and the consultant’s recommendations will be implemented in the development and implementation of actual REDD+ initiatives in the future.

In terms of gender however, if measured simply by gender participation rates, the current Programme has been less than ideal. In the workshops, consultations, focus group discussions, and even the FPIC trials at the field level, the number of men and women participants were still skewed more toward men.

Also in its personnel, the Programme has been problematic in this regard. The Program Board were all men. While there are a few women in leadership positions – i.e. the National Program Manager and her Assistant - in the overall Programme’s organizational set up men still outnumber women. The gender balance among joint programme Assistants is somewhat better as there are more women but still slightly less than men. During the duration of the Programme, 32 consultants were engaged, only nine were women. Also in the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, for instance, there are very few women.

However, this is a reflection of the general condition in the country and the Programme has been constrained by the reality of gender imbalances within its partners and stakeholders. During the relative short duration of the Programme it would have been impossible to insist on a balanced gender representation in all activities without sacrificing the Programme. Serious efforts in correcting those imbalances could not be expected during the relative short-time of the Programme.

The Central Sulawesi Provincial REDD+ Working Group drafted some guide lines on gender¹, and it is expected that in the future planning and implementation of REDD+ those guidelines will help in improving the gender balance within the Programme as well as within the participating stakeholders. One interesting activity worth noting is that in Central Sulawesi the Programme hosted a talk-show on the Role of Women in Forest Management with an all women cast of speakers.

On the other hand, it can be said that the current the Programme has followed FPIC principles in that nearly all conceptual preparatory activities for REDD+ have been carried out through various consultations and focus group discussions with a myriad of stakeholders from the national and provincial level.

IV.D. Risk Management

Two key strategy components stated in the Programme document are (1) the assessment of trade-offs and risks of REDD to sustainable development and (2) the assessment of risks of the REDDI strategy. The inherent risks related to delivering REDD benefits were identified, i.e. non-permanence due to leakage, disparity of benefits due elite capture, corruption, market fungibility, and others. However, while the joint programme document mentions various risk management alternatives, in fact there have been no activities initiated to mitigate these risks as yet. Again this is because of the “readiness” nature of the Programme which is not designed to implement actual REDD+ initiatives.

A myriad of other risks were identified during the conceptual phase of the Programme and included in the Programme’s logical framework. Furthermore the Programme plans included the monitoring of risks as part of the joint programme assurance functions, and stated that a Risk Log and Issue Log will be reviewed on a quarterly basis. Those logs would be discussed with the PMU for counter measures or management response. The review of the Programme documents show that The Risk Log was updated in 2009.

A review of those risks in presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Review of Risks Identified

Risks/Assumptions as Stated in the UN-REDD Programme Logframe Document	Current Situation Related to Stated Risks and Assumptions
The REDD policy development is not dramatically interrupted by election and possible change in administration Elections may change the political landscape on REDD	This is still a risk, general national elections will be held in April 2014. The resulting change in government might indeed result in policy changes related to REDD+

¹ *Panduan Safeguard Gender* [Gender Safeguard Guidelines], Ruikmini P. Toheke, Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, Juni 2012

Risks/Assumptions as Stated in the UN-REDD Programme Logframe Document	Current Situation Related to Stated Risks and Assumptions
Government and local partner agencies cooperate effectively Authorities are willing to cooperate Implementing partners are capable to allocate skillful staff	There are still jurisdictional conflicts between key agencies which may hamper effective cooperation. Implementing agencies are still constrained in their availability of skilled staff.
Single agencies dominate the process	The REDD+ Agency recently established has been given broad mandate to coordinate REDD+ in the country and thus will become an dominant player. However, whether or not this agency will dominate the REDD+ playing field still remains to be seen and will depend on its approach in carrying out its tasks.
Commitment from all partners	Commitment of the stakeholders in at the National level and in Central Sulawesi to the UN-REDD Programme has been good, but might dissipate due to lack of follow-up activities.
Institutional relationships strengthened	A REDD+ Working Group has been established in Central Sulawesi, but it is an ad-hoc agency whose future is dependent on the availability of a REDD+ programme in that province. Informal relationships among individuals from various agencies have developed, but whether these relationships will endure and be productive in terms of REDD+ remains to be seen.
Government supports targeting controversial forestry issues, like oil palm expansion, mining and illegal logging	The Government has declared a moratorium on the issuance of new logging permits which recently has been extended for another two years. Also the licenses for oil palm plantations are more stringent and there are considerations to direct those plantations to degraded lands.
Capital investments and training are delivered in a timely fashion	In hindsight it can be said that these activities were implemented too soon; because there are currently no actual REDD+ activities there are also no opportunities for practical application to maintain and strengthen the learning acquired.
Institutional coordination is effective	One of the main mandates of the recently established REDD+ Agency is the coordination of REDD+ activities of all stakeholders.
Sufficient staff, equipment and other resources are dedicated to the task	The government did allocate sufficient staff to the UN-REDD Programme Indonesia
Adequate methodology selected for demonstration of MRV	Staff has been trained in the necessary methodologies. The REL has been set, and the MRV has been conceptualized but no demonstration activities have been implemented yet.
Baseline established at inception	Except for REL, only very general data available.
There is a need for a clear data management and data sharing policy among information providers and users	To a certain extent relevant data is available, but it still scattered among various agencies. It is expected that the recently established REDD+ agency will coordinate

Risks/Assumptions as Stated in the UN-REDD Programme Logframe Document	Current Situation Related to Stated Risks and Assumptions
Basic information is available (satellite images, reference data) Ministry of Forestry departments unwilling to exchange data sets, and share with FORDA	collaboration among relevant agencies.
REDD implementers are unwilling to share experiences/technologies due to commercial or political interests	Not proven as yet as REDD+ is not a reality as yet.
No national legislation enabling the payment system(s)	Studies have been conducted on local Payment for Environmental Services Schemes and possible payment systems. This will now probably be under the jurisdiction of the REDD+ Agency and Ministry of Finances.
Lack up-front payments impacting local commitments	Not proven as REDD+ is not yet under implementation.
Climate Change impacts lead to significant changes in forest ecology.	The relationship between carbon emissions and climate change, and the role of forests in the mitigation of climate change has been proven by many studies. Some adaptation and mitigation projects have been initiated in the country. Specific studies at REDD+ sites need to be conducted.
REDD commitment is not dependent on <i>Bupati</i> only but based on stakeholder wide support <i>Bupati</i> /DPRD willing to make changes in forest use and status DPRD approves district based spatial plans,	As the <i>kabupaten</i> has autonomy, the <i>Bupati</i> 's support is a prerequisite to start-up actual REDD+ initiatives, but the current Programme has not worked at the <i>kabupaten</i> level as yet. Assumption not proven yet as no REDD+ activities have been carried out in the districts . This might depend on the realization of the anticipated incentives, as compared to current benefits from forest use.
Forestry authorities willing to participate and go for consensus	The Forestry authorities agreed to and were willing to participate in the UN-REDD Programme, however, REDD+ goes beyond the forestry sector and wider consensus will be needed.

The UN-REDD Programme is a multi-stakeholder effort with activities ranging from the formulation of policies at the national level to community level consultations. In such projects there are bound to be risks inherent in any effort to encourage change and involving many diverse stakeholders. The ideas, policies and systems for REDD+ that it aims to introduce might not be in line with the predominant thinking, established policies, and the way people do things, and thus conflict and even cause confrontation among stakeholders. These are risks that should be anticipated.

While perhaps not explicitly intended for this purpose, the participatory approach and inclusiveness of the Programme's Executive Board and the Working Groups that it established, has been one way of creating a common understanding amongst potentially conflicting stakeholders.

However, as stated before, during the implementation of the UN-REDD Programme Indonesia some “new” stakeholders emerged, This reflected larger political conflicts between some of the main stakeholders that emerged because of differing views and the defense of perceived mandates and impacted how the Programme was implemented limiting its achievements. This conflict could not be anticipated, but fortunately the Programme did adjust to the emerging situation, i.e. by establishing a cooperative relationship with the REDD+ Task Force.

As nearly all forestry programs, inherent in REDD+ are social risks, especially those related to local or traditional communities living in and around the forests which potentially could be negatively impacted by REDD+ activities. These risks are to be managed, among others by ensuring that those communities are consulted through the FPIC procedures. However, to what extent FPIC can mitigate or overcome those social risks will depend on how it is implemented.

V. SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNT (CONCLUSIONS) AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As stated before, evaluation mission found the UN-REDD Programme in Indonesia to be a generally well implemented and well documented Programme; it carried out all activities which were planned. The various reports showed good analysis and reflection on the activities carried out with recommendations for improvement of the consultations processes making it difficult for the evaluators to add much.

The internal logic of the Programme’s design is consistent and in line with reaching the desired OUTCOMES. However, the time frame was not realistic as the activities to be carried out were not executable in the time frame originally foreseen. This necessitated an extension of the Programme.

The Programme was designed as a preparatory phase for REDD readiness. However, at the time of the design of the project it was not clear when and what follow-up REDD+ activities would be forthcoming. This has resulted in a lengthy hiatus between phases which put at risk the future usefulness of the work already completed.

- ***IN CONCLUSION: The evaluation mission feels that the UN-REDD programme for Indonesia was very relevant in its content and in its timing.***
- ***IN CONCLUSION: The evaluation mission feels that the results in relation to the amount invested were well worth the effort.***
- ***IN CONCLUSION: The choice of implementing partner for the execution of the UN-REDD joint programme, while logical at the time, became problematic when new elements came to bear (a very large sum made available for future REDD+ activities).***
- ***IN CONCLUSION: Financing REDD readiness programmes make more sense if a REDD+ programme will be immediately available upon completion of the “readiness phase.”***

RECOMMENDATION 1 RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS CONCLUSION:

In designing future readiness support programmes, UN-REDD should consider what will be the immediate follow-up.

- ***IN CONCLUSION:*** *Surrounding Communities can only be expected to change their behavior from being a cause of forest degradation and depletion to behaving as “forest wardens” if they get direct and indirect benefits which they can directly link to forest conservation. Secure land-tenure and/or assurance of rights to forest products is a main motivation for communities to be willing to invest their time and effort in long-term endeavors, and for REDD+ initiatives to be sustainable the projects or programmes need to deal with this issue.*

RECOMMENDATION 2 RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS CONCLUSION:

Pilot forest improvement activities designed to add value that can translate into real income for surrounding communities, should be part and parcel of REDD readiness programmes.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS CONCLUSION:

The technical assistance, and capacity building activities should not only include the REDD+ specific aspects (i.e. carbon calculation, REL, MRV, BDS, etc.) but also more general forest management capacities, including the socio-political aspects of multi-stakeholder planning and collaboration.

- ***IN CONCLUSION:*** *Financial sustainability will depend on the government (at the national and/or provincial level) or external sources, providing funding for REDD + activities.*

RECOMMENDATION 4 – RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS CONCLUSION:

To ensure inclusion of funding for REDD+ initiatives in the government’s budget, to the extent possible, REDD+ planning should be integrated the government’s regular planning processes.

RECOMMENDATION 5 – RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS CONCLUSION:

The new REDD+ Agency of the GoI should consider including Central Sulawesi as a second pilot province in order to capitalize and consolidate the advances that the UN-REDD joint programme has achieved there.

- ***IN CONCLUSION:*** *As a result of the UN-REDD joint programme and other parallel efforts, the conditions for long-term institutional sustainability for a REDD+ environment seem to be present.*
- ***IN CONCLUSION:*** *The current understanding and commitment of the population to REDD+ values seems to be adequate. Keeping up the message and the momentum in the next few years will be crucial to its consolidation.*
- ***IN CONCLUSION:*** *The UN-REDD joint programme, and even with all the negative external factors it was confronted with, has indeed made an important contribution towards the success of a future REDD+ programme. However, this potential contribution depends on how well the Programme’s achievements can be maintained in the period between the present and the time actual REDD+ initiatives can be realized.*

RECOMMENDATION 6 – RELATED TO THE PREVIOUS CONCLUSION:

To the extent possible, the achievements of the UN-REDD Programme – the Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, the Eastern Indonesia University Network on REDD+, the pool of personnel knowledgeable about the various aspects of REDD+, etc. – should be supported and maintained and supported by the government through its continued engagement and utilization.

- **IN CONCLUSION:** The evaluation mission judges that the funding was spent adequately.
- **IN CONCLUSION:** The evaluation feels that the choice of the IP partner and the rest of the management structure of the UN-REDD joint programme was the most logical at the time they were conceived and that the resources allocated were relatively well managed.

ANNEXES

Annex 1 - List of persons interviewed

Annex 2 - List of Documentation reviewed

Annex 3 - Theory of Change Analysis

Annex 4 - Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Mission

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

The following is a list of the people interviewed. They were purposely selected based on their knowledge of the program and in most cases recommended by UNDP Indonesia staff. Some relevant and knowledgeable resource people were recommended, but were not interviewed because of their availability during the time period or time constraints.

1. Mr. Abdul Rauf University of Tadulako, Palu, Central Sulawesi; Lecturer at the Faculty of Agriculture
2. Mr. Abdul Situmorang (Ucok) UN-REDD Programme Indonesia Team Leader 1: Strengthening Multi-Stakeholder Participation and Consensus at National and Provincial Level
...
3. Mr. Agus Hernadi UN-REDD Programme Indonesia Team Leader 3: Capacity Building for REDD Implementation at Decentralized Level
4. Mr. Agus Ngurah Krisna
Kepakistan Section Head Lore Lindu National Park, Member of Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group
5. Mr. Amran Tambaru, Member of Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group. NGO Representative, Director Yayasan Merah Putih (YMP)
6. Mr. Anton Sri Probiyantono UNDP Indonesia
7. Mr. Basah Hernowo Director of Forestry and Water Resource Conservation, the Ministry of National Development Planning/ National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)
8. Mr. Budhi Sayoko UNDP Indonesia
9. Mr. Doddy S. Sukadri National Council on Climate Change, Advisor
10. Mr. Harijoko Siswo Prasetyo Lore Lindu National Park, Chief
11. Mr. Hermawan Indrabudi UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, Team Leader 2: Methodology Development: Establishing a REL, MRV and fair payment systems
12. Mr. Heru Prasetyo Deputy I, Special Unit of President for Monitoring and Controlling Development (UKP4)/ REDD+ Task Force
13. Ms. Laksmi Banowati Ministry of Forestry, National Project Manager UN-REDD Programme Indonesia
14. Mr. Machfud Chief Technical Advisor UN-REDD /Consultant
15. Ms. Martha Maulidia FAO Program Officer in UN-REDD Programme
16. Ms. Marthe Hotvedt Royal Norwegian Embassy, Councillor
17. Mr. Muslim Kusdaryono Association of Forest Businesses (APHI), Central Sulawesi Branch
18. Mr. Nahardi Head Central Sulawesi Provincial Forest Service,
19. Ms. Nita Irawati Murjani Royal Norwegian Embassy, Advisor for Forestry and Climate Change
20. Mr. Nurdin Mangsung Central Sulawesi Provincial Forest Service, Section Head for Conservation, Member of Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group
21. Mr. Punkii.. National Development Planning Board (Bappenas)
22. Mr. Rachmat Saleh (Oyong) Member of Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group, NGO Representative

23. Mr. Rizal Mahmud Indonesian Alliance of Indigenous Communities (AMAN), Coordinator for Central Sulawesi
24. Mr. Rogier J. M. Klaver FAO Program Officer in UN-REDD Programme
25. Mr. Roy Rahendra REDD+ Task Force; Chair Knowledge Management Working Group
26. Mr. Stefanus Yusuf PT. Eco-green Resources
27. Mr. Teteng Riswara Branch Manager, Balantak Rimba Rejeki, Representative Central Sulawesi Commissariat of APHI (National Timber Business Association, Member Central Sulawesi REDD+ Working Group.
28. Mr. Thomas Enters, UN-REDD Regional Coordinator, United Nations Environment Programme
29. Mr. Yuyu Rahayu Ministry of Forestry, National Project Director UN-REDD Programme Indonesia

ANNEX 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

Development of REDD+ Strategy

1. Rancangan Strategi Nasional REDD+ (Revisi tanggal 18 November 2010).
2. Strategi Daerah REDD+ Sulawesi Tengah, 2012
3. Rekomendasi Rencana Implementasi REDD+ Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, December 10, 2012
4. Recommendation on Provincial REDD+ Implementation Plan Central Sulawesi, Silvia Irawan, 2012
5. Laporan Akhir Road Map MRV Sektor Kehutanan, I Nengah Surati Jaya and M Buce Saleh, Pusat Inventarisasi Hutan Kementerian Kehutanan, 2011
6. Policy Recommendation: Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) Instrument for Indigenous Communities and/- or Local Communities who will be Affected by REDD+ Activities, The National Forestry Council and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, March 2011
7. Rekomendasi Kebijakan: Instrumen Free, Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) Bagi Masyarakat Adat Dan Atau Masyarakat Lokal Yang Akan Terkena Dampak dalam Aktivitas REDD+ di Indonesia, Dewan Kehutanan Nasional dan UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, Maret 2011.
8. Jalan Panjang Penataan Kembali Kebijakan Kehutanan Di Indonesia Catatan Proses Penyusunan Rancangan Strategi Nasional REDD+ Indonesia, Penulis: Rio Ismail, Rini Astuti; Editor: Abdul Wahib Situmorang, Machfudh, Laksmi Banowati, Nanda Febriani Munandar, Januari 2012
9. Process Book Long Way Restructuring Forestry Policies In Indonesia, Notes from process of developing Indonesian National Strategy for REDD+ ; Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia; January 2011.
10. Geopolitical Map of Redd+ Negotiation: An analytical report, UN-REDD Indonesia Programme, October 2012.
11. Panduan Pengembangan Kebijakan REDD+ di Daerah Secara Partisipatif dan Multi Pihak: Belajar dari Pendekatan Partisipatif dan Multi Pihak yang Dikembangkan oleh UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, Author: Rio Ismail, editors: Abdul Wahib Situmorang, Mahcfudh, Laksmi Banowati, Nanda Febriani Munandar, Direktorat Jendral Planologi, Kementerian Kehutanan dan UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, 2011
12. Rencana Aksi Daerah Penurunan Emisi Gas Rumah Kaca Sulawesi Tengah, ...
13. REDD+ In Indonesia: Information, Monitoring & Measurement, Reporting And Verification (MRV), April 2011
14. Multi Stakeholders Approach for Developing Indonesia's First REDD+ Strategy: Lessons Learned from Consultation Process (brochure).
15. Design Roadmap Of Indonesia REDD+ Funding And Compliant, Benefit/Incentives Distribution System, Machfudh, Chief Technical Advisor, UN-REDD, 2011
16. Road Map Pembangunan Kehutanan Berbasis Hutan Tanaman dan Taman Nasional (PowerPoint presentation)
17. Road Map Pembangunan Kehutanan Berbasis Taman Nasional (PowerPoint presentation)
18. Report on Policy Research on National Forest Inventory, Agus Setyarso (Principal Researcher), November 2012
19. Rekomendasi Kebijakan Penggunaan Toolkit untuk Optimalisasi Berbagai Manfaat REDD+, Dr. Henry Barus (Konsultan UN-REDD untuk Optimalisasi Multiple Benefit REDD+)

20. Hutan Tanaman dan Taman Nasional Sebagai Ujung Tombak Pembangunan Kehutanan Indonesia; Menempatkan Pembangunan Hutan Tanaman dan Pengelolaan Taman Nasional Dalam Kerangka Kerja REDD+. Robi Royana, 2012.
21. Peraturan Gubernur Sulawesi Tengah Nomor.37 Tahun 2012 Tentang Pedoman Umum Pelaksanaan Free, Prior And Informed Consent Pada Reducing Emissions From Detorestation Ai'id Forest Degradation Plus Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah
22. Advisory Note/Nota Saran tentang Strategi Komunikasi REDD+, Gugus Tugas Nasional Sosialisasi REDD+

Capacity Building

23. REDD dan LULUCF, Panduan Untuk Negosiator, Doddy S. Sukadri, Kemenhut RI, DNPI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.
24. Istilah-Istilah Dalam Redd+ dan Perubahan Iklim, Machfudh, Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012
25. Central Sulawesi's Readiness to Implement REDD+ after 2012, UN-REDD Programme Indonesia,
26. Institutional Mapping on REDD+ Knowledge and Learning Facility At Central Sulawesi, Muhammad Farid, Direktorat Jendral Planologi, Kementerian Kehutanan, and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia
27. Profil Pelatihan Perubahan Iklim Dan REDD+, Pusat Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Kehutanan Badan Penyuluhan dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Kehutanan, Kementerian Kehutanan, Mei 2012.
28. Scoping Mission Report and Proposal for UN-REDD Capacity Development Initiative(s) in Central Sulawesi Province: Internal Draft for Discussion; Ashley Palmer, November 2011
29. UN-REDD Programme In Indonesia, Communications Strategy, Jonathan Wootliff, September 2011
30. Keputusan Gubernur Sulawesi Tengah nomor 522/84/Dishutda-GST/2011 tentang Pembentukan Kelompok Kerja Reducing Emissions From Deforestation and Forest Degradation Plus (Pokja REDD+) Propinsi Sulawesi Tengah Tahun 2011.
31. Decree of The Governor of Central Sulawesi Number: 522/84/Dishutda-Gst/2011 Concerning the Establishment of the Working Group on Reducing Emissions From Deforestation and Forest Degradation Plus (REDD+ Working Group) of Central Sulawesi Province 2011.
32. Belajar dan Penyardar-Tahuan REDD+, Lincolina F Soegito & Lusina Walujat, UN-REDD Indonesia, October 2012
33. Capacity Assessment on Knowledge, Learning, and General Awareness Of REDD+, Lincolina F Soegito & Lusina Walujati, UN-REDD Indonesia, 2012
34. Laporan Delegasi Kementerian Kehutanan pada UNFCCC COP-16, - Buku 1
35. Matriks Catatan Harian Delegasi Ri Kementerian Kehutanan Dan Partners UNFCCC COP-16, Cancun, Mexico, 29 November-10 Desember 2010, Delegasi Kementerian Kehutanan, Kementerian Kehutanan, Desember, 2010
36. Panduan Pengembangan Kebijakan REDD+ di Daerah Secara Partisipatif dan Multi Pihak, Belajar dari Pendekatan Partisipatif dan Multi Pihak yang Dikembangkan oleh UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, Rio Ismail (Author), Editors: Abdul Wahib Situmorang, Mahcfudh, Laksmi Banowati, Nanda Febriani Munandar. @ UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, & UNEP, 2011

Methodology Development

37. Kajian Metode Dan Rancangan National Forest Inventory (NFI) Indonesia Dan Rekomendasi Penyempurnaannya, Ruslandi, Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.
38. Historical Emission of Central Sulawesi Province (REL Brief Paper #2), Indrawan Suryadi, UN-REDD Programme Indonesia,
39. Penyempurnaan National Forest Inventory (NFI) Untuk Inventarisasi Stok Dan Estimasi Emisi Karbon Hutan Tingkat Provinsi, Untuk mendukung Inventarisasi Gas Rumah Kaca Nasional, (Dokumen NFI no.2).
40. Petunjuk Teknis Pengukuran Stok Karbon Pada Plot Contoh National Forest Inventory, Ruslandi, @ Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.
41. Laporan Pelaksanaan Lapangan National Forest Inventory (Nfi) Yang Isempurnakan Di Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, Dokumen Penyempurnaan NFI no.4,
42. Estimasi Cadangan Karbon Sulawesi Tengah Dengan Desain Plot National Forest Inventory, Laporan Kegiatan Untuk UN-REDD Indonesia, Fadjar Pambudhi
43. Methodological Options & Provisional Reference Emission Level of Central Sulawesi, UN-REDD Program Technical Report, Indrawan Suryadi, Abdul Rauf, and Martha Maulida,
44. Petunjuk Teknis Perhitungan Reference Emission Level Untuk Sektor Berbasis Lahan, Indrawan Suryadi, Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.
45. Berbagai Pilihan Metodologi dalam Perhitungan Tingkat Emisi Acuan (Emission Level) untuk Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, REL Brief Paper #3, Indrawan Suryadi. UN-REDD Indonesia Programme.
46. Pemetaan dan Analisa Mekanisme Pendanaan Nasional, Pengelolaan Hibah, Wali Amanah dan Mekanisme Pasar yang Ada Terkait dengan Aktivitas REDD+ Di Indonesia, Fitri Harto SH, Msc,
47. Provisional Reference Emission Level of Central Sulawesi (Draft), Indrawan Suryadi, Abdul Rauf, and Martha Maulida,
48. Pembelajaran Tahapan Identifikasi Provisional Tingkat Emisi Acuan di Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, Lesson Learned Paper, Indrawan Suryadi,
49. Reference Emission Level Berbasis Lahan dan Identifikasi Strategi Mitigasi dalam RAD-GRK, Indrawan Suryadi,
50. Tingkat Emisi Acuan (REL, Reference Emission Levels) Bidang Kehutanan Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, Rauf Ompo,
51. Collecting information and compilation of the existing payment mechanism through internet and literature searching as well as direct communication with the stakeholders involved.
52. Analisis Keuntungan dan Kendala Mekanisme Pembayaran Jasa Lingkungan dari Mekanisme yang ada, Paper dipresentasikan di FGD 2, Hotel Santika Jakarta, 19 Mei 2011, authors: A. Ng. Gintings, K.L. Ginoga, N. Sumedi, D. Djaenudin, F. Nurfatriani, Indartik, dan M. Lugina,
53. Design Of A REDD+ Compliant Benefit Distribution System for Indonesia, Dodik Ridho Nurrochmat and Lindayanti Sulistiawati, UN-REDD PROGRAM, September 2012,
54. Using Spatial Information to Promote Multiple Benefits from REDD+ in Indonesia, A Compendium of Maps for Central Sulawesi Province, Simon Blyth, Corinna Ravilious, Judin Purwanto, Cordula Epple, Valerie Kapos, Henry Barus, Hasbi Afkar, Adi Setyawan and Blaise Bodin, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre,
55. Options for REDD+ action: What Are Their Effects on Forests And People?, An Introduction for Stakeholders In Central Sulawesi, Cordula Epple and Julia Thorley, The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), 2012.

56. Nota Saran tentang Penggunaan Toolkit untuk Optimalisasi Berbagai Manfaat REDD+ di Sulawesi Tengah, Henry Barus, UNEP-WCMC and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, 2012.

Safeguards

57. Panduan Pelaksanaan Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) - Program UN-REDD+ Di Sulawesi Tengah; Golar, Rizal Mahfud, Syamsul Saifudin, Muslim KUSDARYONO, Mutmainah Korona, Lodewyk Wanundo, Rukmini P. Toheke, Salma Masri, Ade Junaedi, Nurudin, Kelompok Kerja REDD+ Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah, Bidang FPIC Dan Pemberdayaan, Januari, 2012.

58. Implementation Of FPIC, Learning and Trial Process to Build Consensus with the Community in Lembah Mukti Village, Damsol Subdistrict, Donggala District, Central Sulawesi; April 2012

59. Lessons Learnt from the Process of Developing FPIC Guidelines in Central Sulawesi (brochure),

60. Lessons Learnt from The Process of Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC) Trial Village (brochure)

61. Materi-materi Komunikasi REDD+ untuk Memenuhi Hak Masyarakat atas Informasi, Tugas Suprianto, UN-REDD Programme Indonesia.

62. Penerapan Padiatapa Proses Pembelajaran dan Uji Coba untuk Membangun Kesepakatan dengan Warga di Desa Lembah Mukti, Kecamatan Damsol, Kabupaten Donggala, Sulawesi Tengah.

63. Laporan Hasil Evaluasi Proses Ujicoba Penerapan Prinsip Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, Tim Evaluator: Didik Suharjito, Emil O. Kleden, Haryanto R. Putro,

64. Laporan Hasil Kegiatan Rintisan Free, Prior, and Informed Consent dalam Program Rehabilitasi Hutan dan Lahan Kawasan Taman Nasional Lore Lindu. Tim Pelaksana Rintisan FPIC: Nurudin, SP., Msi., : Ade Junaedi, S.Hut., MSi., Dr. Golar, Rukmini P. Toheke, Salma Masri, SH., Rizal Mahfud, Kelompok Kerja REDD+ Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah and UN-REDD Programme Indonesia, Oktober 2012.

65. Panduan Safeguard Gender, Ruikmini P. Toheke, Juni 2012

66. Integrating Gender Into REDD+ Safeguards Implementation In Indonesia, Abidah Billah Setyowati, Jeannette Gurung, PhD., Yani Septiani. November, 2012

67. A Guidance Note to Integrate Gender in Implementing REDD+ Social Safeguards in Indonesia, Women Organizing for Change in Agriculture and Natural Resources Management (WOCAN), November 2012

Pilot Activities

68. The Role of UN-REDD in the Development of REDD+ in Indonesia; Volume I, MAIN REPORT, Ani Mardiasuti, Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.

69. The Role of UN-REDD in The Development of REDD+ in Indonesia; Volume III: Highlight of REDD+ Related Projects in Indonesia, Ani Mardiasuti, Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.

70. Proses Penyiapan REDD+ di Sulawesi Tengah, Suzanna, Kemenhut RI, UN-REDD, FAO, UNDP, UNEP, 2012.

Communication Materials

71. Flipchart Untuk Fasilitator Implementasi Rintisan FPIC

72. Participatory Governance Assessment: The 2012 Indonesia Forest, Land, and REDD+ Governance Index, Abdul Wahib Situmorang and Hariadi Kartodiharjo (coordinator), Tina Salfberg (editor), UNDP, 2013 -

Materials from Bappenas on the emission reduction of Green House Gasses. –

73. IN-REDD Indonesia National Programme, Final Evaluation Terms of Reference.
74. Satu Tahun RAN-GRK – Tentang Rencana Aksi Nasional Penurunan Emisi Rumah Kaca, Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Bappenas), November 2012.
75. Potret Rencana Aksi Daerah Penurunan Emisi Gas Rumah Kaca (RAD-GRK), ... January 2013.
76. Pedoman Penyusunan Rencana Aksi Daerah Penurunan Emisi Rumah Kaca (RAD-GRK), Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Bappenas), 2011.
77. Tool kit Evaluasi FPIC UNREDD Sulteng –
78. Matrik Indikator PGA dalam Implementasi REDD+ di Indonesia Berdasarkan Kategori Isu.
79. Matrik Indikator PGA dalam Implementasi REDD+ di Indonesia Berdasarkan Prinsip-Prinsip Tata Kelola

In addition there were also a number of promotional materials (brochures, leaflets, video, posters) which were reviewed.

ANNEX 3

THEORY OF CHANGE ANALYSIS

The concept of Theory of Change Analysis is to follow the project's design in order of hierarchy, submitting it to a logical framework analysis with a view to determining if the ACTIVITIES planned in the project design were executed and how their interaction lead to the production of the foreseen OUTPUTS. Similarly, the OUTPUTS are analyzed in order to determine how their cumulative effect leads to reaching a specific OUTCOME. Lastly, OUTCOMES are analyzed to determine how they lead to a macro-level Goal. In this process, the effect of external factors on the project logic must also be taken into account.

During a project's life, the logical framework can be modified to reflect changes that may take effect or to improve the logic of the various links. From a revision of the documentation, the evaluation mission found no evidence of that modification of the project's logic.

The overall GOAL of the UN REDD project was:

“To Support the GoI in attaining REDD-Readiness”

From a project design point of view, this GOAL is:

- Undefined as it does not spell out clearly what constitutes “REDD-Readiness”. That is to say: (1) what baseline indicators exist at the time of the project's design that establish why the GoI has still to reach “REDD-Readiness.” (2) What elements need to be in place for the concept of REDD-Readiness to have been achieved (success indicators). (3) As could be expected due to the lack of indicators, there is also no mention of what means of verification (verifiers) would be used to agree that the “success indicators” are present at the end of the project. Lacking these elements, the evaluator can only rely on the OUTCOMES described in the Joint Programme Document and determine if any evident void in the logic exists.
- Another problem with the GOAL as stated is that “REDD-Readiness” is a concept that depends on what REDD+ will entail. Some important elements of REDD+ are still evolving so it is difficult to judge if a state of total readiness has been reached.

As far as the OUTCOMES are concerned, three were identified at the project design stage. They were:

- **OUTCOME 1: Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level.**
- **OUTCOME 2: Successful demonstration of establishing REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture**

- **OUTCOME 3: Capacity established to implement REDD at decentralized levels.**

- Again, at the OUTCOME level, the Joint Programme Document fails to provide baseline and success indicators or pre-determined means of verification of success indicators. Once again therefore, following the hierarchy of project design elements, the evaluator can only rely on the OUTPUTS described in the Joint Programme Document and determine if any evident void in the logic exists.

In relation to the OUTPUTS, the Joint Programme Document mentions nine of them as follows:

Output 1.1 (UNDP): Consensus on key issues for national REDD policy development

Output 1.2 (UNDP): REDD lessons learned

Output 1.3 (UNEP): Program

Output 2.1 (FAO) Improved capacity and methodology design for forest carbon inventory within a MARV system, including a sub-national pilot implementation

Output 2.2 (FAO) Reference emissions level (REL)

Output 2.3 (UNDP) Harmonized fair and equitable payment mechanism at provincial level

Output 2.4 (UNEP): Toolkit for priority setting towards maximizing potential carbon-benefits and incorporating co-benefits, such as biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation under MDG goals

Output 3.1 (UNDP): Capacity for spatial socio-economic planning incorporating REDD at the district level

Output 3.2 (UNDP) : Empowered local stakeholders are able to benefit from REDD

Output 3.3 (UNDP) : Multi-stakeholder-endorsed District plans for REDD implementation

The Joint Programme Document does provide baseline and success indicators, though not pre-agreed means of verification (verifiers). However, the quality and specificity of the indicators are not what they should be.

Per example for OUTPUT 1.1 a baseline indicator is stated as “(the) NFI (1989-97) is outdated and needs to be further developed.” but no mention is made of WHY is it considered outdated or an explanation given of WHAT elements need to be further developed. There is no corresponding “success indicator(s)” provided that would allow the evaluators to judge if the quality and scope of a revised National Forest Inventory was adequate.

In the absence of these elements the evaluators have had to rely on using other evaluation techniques such as determining what “the most significant changes” have been and do so based on an assessment of the quality of the products of the Joint Programme (reports and other documents) as well as the perception of Project Personnel, Implementation Partners, potential beneficiaries, observers (NGOs and civil society stakeholders) and others who they interviewed

In respect of OUTCOME 1 “**Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national and provincial level.**” As the evaluation mission noted, there were three weak points in respect of the “communications strategy” as follows:

- The communication strategy was designed well into the project’s execution and the evaluation mission was told that at the time there was no communications officer within the PMU. Apparently UN REDD was unsuccessful in finding a capable replacement for the communications officer who left mid way into the Project.
- Some of the publications were positioned more as tools for public relations and image building, and rather less than tools for knowledge sharing. i.e., the design of the banners, brochures, and posters seem to be more directed at promotion of the Programme rather than at information sharing among the stakeholders. One key person involved in the Programme stated that the communication activities were “piecemeal...many activities happened only once and were not followed up”; this was similar to the observations of the consultant hired to map out the strategy who felt that many of the activities were “more tactical and not strategic.”
- The broader concept of knowledge management; that is to say the management of the communication flow among all stakeholders, the documentation and sharing of cases and lessons learned seemed to have been somewhat weak. Some of these activities were done but apparently not in a systematic way.

The mission however, wishes to commend the UN REDD PMU for having kept very good records on all activities and having documented their results (although not always available in English versions which limit the capacity of evaluators and/or UN entity monitoring officials, other consultants and foreign observers to benefit from them).

In the opinion of the mission, other activities could have been built in at the design stage to maximize the project’s impact, such as the inclusion of pilot activities designed to determine how community interest in support of forest conservation and rehabilitation could be increased. Specifically, through increased income derived from the improvement of forested lands by adding to them “value crops” that are carbon neutral or add to carbon sequestration such as rattan, vanilla, medicinal plants, mushrooms and others. Likewise through eco-tourism related activities such as canopy walkways, nature trails and others still. The evaluation mission makes in its report a recommendation for some follow-up actions in this respect.

However, in spite of these points, the evaluation mission feels that the original design and its implementation were in general terms, adequate. There is no question that the UN REDD joint programme made a significant contribution towards REDD readiness in Indonesia.

➤ ***IN CONCLUSION: In spite of the shortcomings described above, based on a review of the design elements, the various products completed and the interviews completed, the evaluators did not identify any major gaps in the “logic” of the Joint Programme’s design.***

ANNEX 4

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION MISSION