

Evaluation Report

Country:	Indonesia
Project title:	Sustainable Livelihoods in Tsunami affected villages in Aceh Jaya
Project number:	AS 1275 / IDN 1012-05
Allocated amount:	636.500 EUR
Project holder:	Fauna and Flora International (FFI)
Project duration:	07/2005 – 12/2006

Evaluation commissioned by
Deutsche Welthungerhilfe (DWHH)e.V.
(German Agro Action)
for the evaluation period mid November until mid December 2006

Monika Ellinger, January 2007

Monika Ellinger
Friedrich-Ebert-Str. 56
67433 Neustadt/Weinstrasse
Email: mel@monika-ellinger.de

1 Summary of the main results and conclusions including an assessment of following aspects

1.1 Short project description

The project “Sustainable Livelihoods in Tsunami affected villages in Aceh Jaya” is one project of the rehabilitation program of Deutsche Welthungerhilfe/German Agro Action (DWHH/GAA) in Indonesia. It is implemented by the international NGO Fauna and Flora International (FFI).

The purpose of the project is to strengthen livelihoods that contribute to biodiversity conservation and sound management of natural resources in a sustainable manner. Four fields of intervention contribute to reach the purpose: (1) strengthening community organisations to participate in reconstruction program, in land use planning in particular; (2) rebuilding of livelihoods of Tsunami impacted and forest dependent communities; (3) lobbying for environmental friendly material for home reconstruction and (4) mainstreaming environmental concerns into land use planning.

The target groups are the villagers of Tsunami impacted villages that have an impact on forest resources. FFI is implementing the project in cooperation with government institutions, national NGOs, the private sector and research and university institutions.

The project duration is 18 months (July 2005 until December 2006). The project is budgeted with 669.500 EUR of which 636.500 EUR are funded by DWHH/GAA and 33.000 EUR are funded by FFI.

1.2 Project holder analysis

FFI is an international NGO with Headquarters in Great Britain. A regional office for South East Asia is located in Hanoi, Vietnam. FFI Indonesia has an office in Jakarta, Medan and Banda Aceh.

The NGO has been working in Aceh Province since 1998. Before the Tsunami, FFI was focussing on the *Ulu Masen* primary forest in Sumatra. After the Tsunami, FFI expanded its focus towards the rehabilitation process in the Tsunami hit areas.

In 2005 FFI Aceh had employed one international female FFI Aceh Program Manager and 33 national staff. The high increase of funds and programs required recruitment of additional staff. Unfortunately, the recruitment process got much delayed. The FFI Aceh Program Manager was overloaded with work for almost the whole project duration. A restructuring process had started to be implemented in the second half of 2006 and was expected to last at least for another six months.

The FFI personnel have a sound subject matter background in conservation and environmental issues. At field level, knowledge of the local language is a precondition. The expatriate management level by 2006 has long experience in Indonesia and speaks the national language. FFI Aceh is aware of the fact that agricultural know-how is not sufficient. FFI staff requires further technical agricultural as well as managerial (M&E in particular) and methodological (participatory approaches, gender) training.

FFI is financing not only its programs but also its structure via donor funds. FFI contribution for the project consists mainly of funds from British American Tobacco (BAT) and Diakonie Emergency Aid (DEA). In the period 2004 until 2006 altogether 16 donors were funding FFI to implement Tsunami rehabilitation programs in Aceh.

During the project period FFI assets (office infrastructure, IT, logistics) were sufficient. The expansion of programs in 2007 will require additional assets. While the FFI office in Banda Aceh is well equipped, the Field Office in Calang is rated poor. So far it is rather a gathering place for FFI staff than an office that can provide services (documentation, correspondence, networking). The warehouse in Calang has sufficient space, but a management and control system is urgently needed.

M&E is very poor within FFI Aceh. Informal and mainly verbal information and data exchange makes reporting inefficient and ineffective. Documentation of concepts and progresses is poor. On the other hand, PR material is of professional quality (material and content).

1.3 Analysis of situation and target group

The project is targeting the Tsunami impacted population in Aceh Jaya District. The population in Aceh Province has already been heavily impacted by the civil war between the Indonesian government and the Free Aceh Movement (*Gerakan Aceh Merdeka*; GAM) particularly after 1995. A peace agreement was signed in 2002 but its implementation in 2003 failed. Heavy military action forced the population of the higher located forest areas to settle in the lowland. With the Tsunami, up to 50% of the population in certain areas died (36% in Aceh Jaya District). Surviving population became internally displaced persons (IDP) a second time. After the Tsunami and due to the international attention and pressure, a ceasefire agreement was signed in August 2005 and free elections were held in the province in December 2006.

The rehabilitation progress after the Tsunami is much slower than anticipated. Many organisations could not cope with the huge increase of funds. This resulted in overambitious planning of activities and time frames. Coordination was, and still is, poor.

Aceh Jaya has favourable natural framework conditions. The agricultural sector is the driving sector for the regional economy. Marketing channels were well established before the Tsunami. Rainfall is abundant, soil conditions appear fertile. The District has high potential for export crops such as Nilam (*Pogostemon cablin*), rubber, coconut and oil palm, coffee and cocoa. However, ecosystems are fragile especially in areas dominated by peat soils. Changes to vegetation or farming systems require thorough assessments and sensitive approaches. Rice production has highest priority for farming households. This is not due to economic viability but to socio-cultural values. ADB has therefore prioritised the rehabilitation of rice fields in a study done for the National Authority for Reconstruction of Aceh and Nias (*Badan Rehabilitasi dan Rekonstruksi NAD-Nias*, BRR). Other annual crops (peanut, maize, beans) are traditionally cultivated for subsistence and marginally for commercial purpose. Before the Tsunami, farmers used local varieties and hardly any agricultural inputs such as fertilizer or machinery. Small holder plantations are main income sources for farming households. Technical know how needs to be improved for example by introducing economic viable commodities (red chilli) or improving cultivation practices in rubber plantations.

In Aceh Province the importance of the traditional *Mukim* structure reduced after the centralisation policy of the Indonesian government in 1975. Positions were not filled, other position holders were not aware about their role and function anymore. With the decentralisation policy in 1998 the *Mukim* regained importance. The *Mukim* structure is acknowledged by the government. The *Mukim* leader is considered as the decisive decision maker by the communities in the Province. In Aceh Jaya 21 *Mukims* exist.

In the frame of the livelihood development project FFI is directly cooperating with the local NGO *Yayasan Rumbun Bambu Indonesia* (YRBI), with the Organisation for Community Development of the Technology Institute Indonesia in Jakarta (*Lembaga Pengembangan Komunitas*, LAPAK), with the international organisations Caritas Czech, the Hilfswerk

Österreich (HWO) and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), and with the governmental Provincial Nature Conservation Agency (*Badan Konservasi Sumber Daya Alam*; BKSDA) and the Logging Concession Agency (*Balai Sertifikasi Pemanfaatan Hasil Hutan*; BSPHH). A huge number of other international, national and government organisations are implementing rehabilitation programs. Many of these are active in the same sector as FFI, in particular in agriculture and land use planning.

1.4 Analysis and assessment of project preparation

FFI submitted a proposal to DWHH/GAA by April 2005. The proposal basically fitted well to the rehabilitation concept of DWHH/GAA in Aceh Province. However, only by August 2005 the contract was signed. Intensive discussions were ongoing in DWHH/GAA Headquarters for two reasons: (1) normally DWHH/GAA is only funding local NGOs and (2) the original proposal requested a budget frame far beyond the general budget for new partners. A long discussion process started between DWHH/GAA in Germany and FFI in Indonesia that resulted in shorter project duration and reduced budget.

It turned out to be of advantage that FFI had several years of working experience in the area. Unfortunately, the adjustment of budget did not go in line with the adjustment of the content, the indicators in particular. In addition, conducting a planning workshop after about two months of implementation in order to adjust the ambitious proposal to realistic conditions was neither considered by FFI nor by DWHH/GAA.

The frequent change of persons in charge for the project at DWHH/GAA Headquarters was not favouring that the persons feel responsible for the project. In addition the original position of a DWHH/GAA agricultural advisor was skipped. Follow up and backstopping which would have been particularly important in case of a new partner was therefore insufficient. Different to many other INGOs and private initiatives, FFI conducted RRAs in February 2005 in order to identify areas and activities. Being a conservation organisation FFI focused at Tsunami impacted villages that have an impact on forest ecosystems. FFI coordinated with other NGOs in the same sector and the same areas in order to avoid overlaps. The target groups participated only marginally in the planning process. The Field Officers addressed community leaders, thus leaving the risk that inequality in communities was even intensified. During 2005, however this was probably the only feasible approach. In 2006 FFI should have reconsidered target group composition and needs instead of targeting this only by 2007.

1.5 Analysis and assessment of planning / project planning matrix

The original proposal of FFI was shortened from 36 to 18 months. As this did not go in line with conceptual adjustments the planning was overambitious.

The planning matrix was split into four results. This makes the document practicable for steering in theory. Unfortunately, the planning matrix was not used for steering neither at management nor at field level.

The hierarchy of the planning document was not always homogeneous. Especially Result 3 could have been accommodated in a separate project with other donors as it addresses a different target group and requires different expertise and approaches (“Lobbying approach”). Indicators were very vaguely formulated at various impact levels. The sources of verification, however, were all at activity level. In the Tsunami context, remaining at activity level for a project duration of 18 months appears realistic.

In line with the planning documents, financial planning was also overambitious. By the end of the project duration, approx. 23% of the DWHH/GAA budget will remain. Of the budget directly benefiting the target groups (Cash for Work, fertilizer, seed, tools) 72% was spent. A flexible handling of donor funds by FFI is not up to the agreement between DWHH/GAA and

FFI. Still it is rated appropriate in order to get activities started after the long delay of implementation, for which to a large extent the Tsunami context in general has to be made responsible.

1.6 Analysis and assessment of project implementation

Overall the implementation of the planned activities got delayed regarding Results 2 and 3. In case of Result 2, this is partly due to the overall delay of rehabilitation activities and its known reasons not only in Indonesia, but also in Sri Lanka and India. It is also partly due to conceptual and organisational weaknesses of FFI. Overall it seems that the enthusiasm to contribute to the rehabilitation process after the Tsunami and the amount of donor funds passed by far the organisational capacities of FFI (as of many other organisations as well). Regarding the land use planning process (Results 1 and 4) FFI fulfilled the targets to develop land use plans with the participation of the population. It also supported a new and apparently highly valid approach by addressing the *Mukim* instead of the village structure and by supporting a *Mukim* association (*Serikat Mukim*) at District level which has a model character. Organisational strengthening of the *Mukim* and *Serikat Mukim* structures in general, and of the *Kejreung Blang* for agricultural purposes in particular, has not started yet. Reason is to be seen in the overambitious planning. Strengthening the capacities of these structures is however crucial for sustainability. FFI will focus on this issue in the coming phase. Result 3 needs a different approach (“Lobbying approach”) at different levels that requires different strategies. The delay of implementation can be attributed to an inefficient use of human resources by targeting too many fields of intervention. Within the restructuring process, FFI intends to separate different fields of intervention from each other in future. Both DWHH/GAA and FFI have a share in the delay of implementation. There was insufficient clarification of the role of the DWHH/GAA Regional Director between Headquarters and Banda Aceh, resulting in insufficient backstopping and follow up. FFI got seriously delayed in recruiting additional staff. Only mid 2006, with the recruitment of a Livelihood Manager, the FFI Aceh Program Manager could start to delegate certain tasks.

1.7 Impact with regard to development

Impacts are few due to the delay of implementation experienced not only in this project, but in general in Tsunami rehabilitation programs in Indonesia, Sri Lanka and India.

The late recruitment of staff was one reason for delay that can be attributed to FFI. Efficiency of activities was seriously reduced and started to improve slowly with the recruitment of additional staff in the livelihood component. On the other hand efficiency has to be checked regarding the planning of short term consultancies for the land use planning.

Involving *Mukim* organisations and their association (*Serikat Mukim*) in the land use planning process has contributed to raising self-confidence. Their position has been strengthened by raising interest not only of other donors, but also of government institutions. Further organisational development in future is likely to create considerable socio-cultural impacts for the communities.

Economic impacts could hardly be assessed. Few farmers who did not have harvest losses had direct and indirect income of about 170 EUR per planting season. Cash for Work attributed to minor household income after the Tsunami. In 2006 FFI adjusted its strategy to provide Cash for Work per ha instead of per household, thus economic impacts were even more difficult to assess. Some of the beneficiaries had valuable assets in and around their houses. FFI has contributed, if at all, only marginally. Economic impacts need to be assessed in frame of overall rehabilitation processes in the region.

Ecological impacts can be expected in future once the land use plans are implemented in watershed areas and monitored as scheduled. Unexpected ecological impacts of the Tsunami could be observed. These are not linked to project intervention. The risk exists that negative impacts occur on sensitive soils such as peat soils once the vegetation and farming systems are modified due to paddy cultivation or rubber plantation of the government or donor programs.

1.8 Gender mainstreaming

So far gender was not an issue in FFI although this is one of the special fields of the FFI Aceh Program Manager. In a project of rehabilitation time pressure is generally high. Certain target groups are often neglected to the benefit of others. It is likely that this happened also in the past 18 months of project implementation. Not only women but also other social groups might have got neglected. The risk is there that inequalities within the communities got even worse. It is therefore highly recommended for the future to reassess in general and regarding gender mainstreaming in particular the farmer group members, the concept for the *Mukim* organisations and their association and the technical programs. This requires first sensitisation of FFI staff. Other organisations that provide training exist in Banda Aceh or in other provinces in Indonesia.

1.9 Project management

At DWHH/GAA level, follow up and backstopping was neglected. Role and responsibility of the Regional Director towards FFI was insufficiently clarified between DWHH/GAA Germany and Indonesia, resulting in different expectations. Attention by DWHH/GAA towards the FFI project appeared insufficient to the FFI Aceh Program Manager. The first visit to the project area was done in February 2006 while other donors had come regularly also in 2005.

In 2005, FFI management decisions were mainly taken by the FFI Aceh Program Manager and the Protection and Land use Planning Manager in Banda Aceh. With the recruitment of additional staff and the appointment of the Program Director Sumatra, decision making processes are shared by various persons.

FFI is still rather an organisation of verbal character. Information exchange is done verbally in informal meetings. Meetings are just starting to be held on a regular basis. Data collection is not uniform at field level, and between field and management level. Reports to DWHH/GAA were sent irregularly and were of rather poor quality. By May 2006 slight improvement of quality were stated.

The financial administration of FFI was assessed weak by the revision missions of DWHH/GAA in 2005 and 2006. This is partly due to the delayed recruitment of a financial accountant. It was raised by FFI that certain stipulations were insufficiently explained in the contract. DWHH/GAA might need to assess whether other “new” partners raised the same issue in order to respective steps.

Generally, the revised budget lines appeared justified. Financial management was often not in line with the AoA stipulated in the contract with DWHH/GAA. However, the flexible handling of funds appeared justified. DWHH/GAA could be more open to flexibility in exceptional cases if it serves the purpose.

1.10 Recommendations

At present a continuation of the cooperation is neither desired by FFI nor by DWHH/GAA. This appears appropriate to the consultant.

Recommendations are formulated that address FFI directly in the field of (1) capacity development of staff (technical, methodological, managerial and organisational training), (2) M&E and reporting, (3) communication and cooperation with donors and other stakeholders, (4) assets in Calang and (5) organisational issues related to the restructuring process of FFI. Sector recommendations given relate to (1) the farmer group approach and ownership development (reassessment of groups according to needs and vision, integration of *Kejreung Blang* system, withdrawing from free inputs and challenging own contribution, development of sustainable concept for hand tractors), (2) farming technologies and practices (especially agro forestry versus agricultural activities) and (3) the complex of land use planning and the strengthening of *Mukim* structures.

1.11 General insights / conclusions

According to the country strategy concept for Indonesia, DWHH/GAA will involve in Aceh Province for another three years. A need to continue the started activities with the target population is there. Due to the high potential of the province the consultant presumes that within a limited frame of time and resources considerable impacts can be achieved.

Three fields of intervention are suggested for follow up: (1) Agricultural development; (2) Sustainable forest management and (3) Water shed management in the frame of land use planning. The cross-cutting themes “Ecological sustainability” and “Gender” are addressed in these fields. Also non-Tsunami victims should be targeted in future. Overall, a realistic planning for the limited duration of three years only, and an exit strategy are important.

A concept paper was developed by the DWHH/GAA Regional Director in November 2006 that provides a sound basis for the next steps to take. It is crucial that a DWHH/GAA advisor or consultant is appointed full time to coordinate and manage the assessment process. It is then also advised that a DWHH/GAA advisor is attached to the upcoming livelihood development program, even if local NGOs can be identified as partners.