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## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ATLAS  | UNDP’s Enterprise Resource Planning System |
| APBD | GOI Regional Budget |
| APBN | GOI National Budget |
| BAST  | Berita Acara Surat Terimah – Formal hand over of assets to the Government of Indonesia Asset Register to enable ongoing operation and maintenance through APBN budget processes.  |
| BRG  | Badan Restorasi Gambut (Peat Restoration Agency)  |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation  |
| DED | Detail Engineering Design |
| DIM | Direct Implementation Modality  |
| FMIS | Financial Management Information System |
| GOI  | Government of Indonesia  |
| GWL | Ground Water Level |
| KHG | Kesatuan Hidrologis Gambut (Peatland Hydrological Unit) |
| KLHK | Kementrian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan (Ministry of Environment and Forestry)  |
| MCA | Millennium Challenge Account |
| OSCB  | Office Support and Capacity Building |
| PMU | Project Management Plan |
| Renstra | Action Plan |
| RFP  | Request for Proposals  |
| RREG  | Rencana Restorasi Ekosistem Gambut (Peat Ecosystem Restoration Plan)  |
| SID  | Survey Identification Design |
| SOP | Standard Operation Procedure |
| UGM | Universitas Gajah Mada |
| UNDP  | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNPDF  | United Nations Partnerships for Development Framework  |
| WRI  | World Resource Institute |

## Executive Summary

In response to the 2015 Peatland fires in Indonesia, the Government of Indonesia changed their fire prevention strategy in 2016 to adopt a more anticipatory and systematic approach. In response, the Peat Restoration Agency (Badan Restorasi Gambut – BRG) was established through Presidential Regulation June 1 of 2016 to develop and implement this new approach.

To assist the GOI in establishing the Agency, the Kingdom of Norway responded by requesting The Strengthening the BRG Institution Through Office Support and Capacity Building (OSCB) project as a continuation of the previous Support Facility to the Indonesia Peat Restoration Agency (BRG). The project aimed to improve BRG’s institutional capacity through the provision of short-term administrative, logistical, and technical support.

The UNDP Support Facility, implemented from 2016 to 2018, was tasked with developing BRG’s institutional readiness to coordinate the restoration of 2.6 million hectares of damaged peatland in Riau, Jambi, South Sumatera, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan, and Papua provinces. In addition to this, the Support Facility supported the development of the organizational structure, peatland mapping, and strategic planning, making BRG eligible to receive funding from the state budget.

The report evaluates the achievements, outcomes, and lessons learned through UNDPs support to BRG. A team of two evaluation experts met with key stakeholders at the national and provincial levels of government and a range of NGO partners who demonstrated alternative peatland livelihood systems. The evaluation approach that was implemented is in line with the United Nations system of evaluation procedures and standards, as well as the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

Over the two years, UNDP provided support to BRG, which was able to grow from an initial organization of six staff to a fully functioning agency capable of managing a significant GOI budget in line with government procedures. UNDP support has enabled BRG to effectively implement its Action Plan (Renaksi) and achieve credible outcomes in the short time.

When BRG was established, it was tasked to restore more than two million hectares of damaged peatland. At the time, the agency was only provided with one Head, one Secretary, and four Deputies. As a result of the limited staff, it was very difficult for BRG to operate using GOI budget, as the budget had not yet been mobilised. In this situation, UNDP, funded by the Government of Norway, played a significant role in helping the agency survive, become institutionally ready, and able to fulfill its targets. UNDP has provided fundamental support to BRG to enable the agency to evolve and perform its mandate.

Key achievements of BRG include the following:

* Developed peat ecosystem restoration plans (Rencana Restorasi Ekosistem Gambut – RREG) that explained the specific location of peat hydrological units (Kesatuan Hidrologi Gambut – KHG) in all seven targeted provinces, describing their condition and function, as well as detailing any intervention to be undertaken to restore these KHGs;
* In cooperation with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, the Government Regulation No 71, Year 2014 was revised to form Government Regulation No 57 Year 2016. The new regulation emphasizes a moratorium of any land clearing in the peat lands until the government stipulates protection and cultivation zones in peat ecosystems for certain plants.
* Established a Command Centre at the Directorate General (DG) of Law Enforcement at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) Office. The Centre will become the main entry point for coordination between BRG and KLHK and is now operational. SOPs for the Centre were developed and Inspectors will be trained in 2019 using KLKH APBN funding in 2019.
* Five pilot activities involving national level universities (UGM and IPB), local universities (Universitas Riau and Universitas Palangkaraya), and CSOs (WALHI).
* Supported the enactment of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry Regulation No. P.61/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/11/2017 on delegation of several Central Government on Environment and Forestry tasks on Peat Restoration to the Governors of Riau, Jambi, South Sumatera, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan and Papua.

In just over 24 months, UNDP finalised over 1,000 contracts ranging from USD $14 to USD $112,186. In the first quarter alone, over 160 purchase orders were finalised by the UNDP procurement team.

The evaluation found that the support was highly relevant to the needs of the GOI and was in line with the focus of the Kingdom of Norway to support GOI in addressing environmental issues. Norway found that UNDP was appropriate, effective, and efficient. Engaging UNDP to provide this support with its extensive capabilities and experience was highly appropriate and was in line with the UN Country strategy to support GOI in sustainably managing its natural resources. All parties agreed that the overall implementation was effective. Over two years, this support enabled the BRG to grow from a very small organization to a fully functioning agency with significant national government funding. UNDP’s support further allowed both BRG and KLHK to procure equipment and services that would have been difficult to procure under government procurement regulations in a short time frame.

UNDP’s provision of resources was efficient, as they were integrated within UNDP’s existing procurement systems to minimize duplication of resources. UNDP staff met PMU and BRG staff on a regular basis to make sure that all procurement needs met stakeholder expectations. UNDPs support will be completed in 2018 and enable BRG to continue effectively operating until the end of their mandate in 2020. Through the provision of essential equipment, recruiting staff, and contracting NGOs, BRG will be able to continue implementing its activities post-UNDP support through APBN funding.

UNDP in the future should develop a Financial Management Information System (FMIS) that can enable Government Partners to monitor expenditure against budget. Financial information from UNDP’s Enterprise Resource Planning System, ATLAS, should be able to be readily transferred to a simple FMIS that Government counterparts can easily monitor against the agreed budget.

Supporting newly established organizations like BRG requires appropriate levels of support from procurement and HR teams to ensure resources are mobilized in a timely manner. Support is required to draft and finalize scope of services, Terms of Reference, tendering, and finalizing all documentation to meet UNDP operational guidelines. For technical procurement, flexibility should be given to recruit additional capacity. UNDP provided dedicated procurement staff to facilitate this process.

## Introduction

One of the key lessons learned from the 2015 peat and forest fires was that suppressing fires on drained deep tropical peatland is extremely difficult, ineffective, and costly. The total economic loss was estimated to be in excess of USD $15 billion (MoEF, 2015; CIFOR, 2015; World Bank, 2016). This estimate did not include the loss of biodiversity, carbon emissions, and the irreversible long-term health impacts. The Global Fire Emission Database estimated the event emitted roughly 1,750 milllion metric tonns of CO2 into the atmosphere.

Acknowledging this major lesson from 2015, the Government of Indonesia (GOI) concluded that prevention is by far the most effective way to tackle these fires, and concerted efforts should be made to prevent future fires on peatland and forests. Recent analyses found that fire vulnerability in Indonesia has increased over the past two decades, and that the government’s previous efforts have not yet been fully effective. Therefore, the GOI changed their fire prevention strategy in 2016 to adopt a more anticipatory and systematic approach. The establishment of an agency with high levels of accountability was defined as a key element of this strategy. Through the Presidential Regulation June 1 of 2016, the Peat Restoration Agency (Badan Restorasi Gambut – BRG) was established. It’s mandate was to coordinate and facilitate peat restoration of 2.4 million hectares in seven Indonesian provinces: Riau, Jambi, South Sumatra, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan, and Papua.

In order to assist BRG’s institutional readiness and ability to undertake its mandate, the GOI requested support from international donors. In response to this request, the Kingdom of Norway agreed to provide financial assistance to BRG through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNDP has provided support during two phases:

* Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency Phase I (2016 – 2017)
* Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency Phase II (2017 – 2018)

Through this support, UNDP assisted and facilitated BRG with administration, procurement, financial, and monitoring tasks. Moreover, this support enabled BRG to facilitate and coordinate peat restoration efforts, as well as harmonize national policies on peat protection and management through the acceleration of the revision of Government Regulation June 71 Year 2014. The support has assisted the Peatland Hydrologycal Unit (KHG) to develop models for peat restoration.

## Description of the Intervention

The Support Facility for the Institutional Setup of the Indonesia Peat Restoration Agency was established to ensure that BRG is appropriately staffed, financed, and institutionalized to meet its mandates. The facility primarily supported BRG’s operation, financial administration, monitoring, and the provision of technical inputs from UNDP’s in-house-experts and global network. This ensured that activities implemented by BRG under the secretariat achieved their expected outputs. The support included recruitment of staff, procurement of goods and services, and the recruitment of experts.

This enabled BRG to mobilize resources in a timely manner. The focus of the intervention was to ensure BRG has the capacity and resources to continue operations without continued UNDP support post-2018.

Phase I of the Project, 2016 – 2017 had the following outputs:

Output 1 – BRG is equipped with the necessary components that will make it an effective institution to deliver its mandates.

Output 2 – BRG’s inputs for the revision of Government Regulation No 71 Year 2014 on Peat Ecosystem Protection and Management is in place followed by the drafting of relevant ministerial regulations or decrees.

Output 3 – The peat restoration implementation models are in place and serve as key reference for peat restoration undertaken by central government, sub-national governments, and Civil Society partners.

The Project’s Theory of Change (Diagram 1) defines the Project logic for Phase II, 2017 – 2018, based upon the following three outputs:

Output 4 – BRG’s core institutional support functions and peatland operational equipment is established.

Output 5 – Strengthen BRG’s engagement with a wide coalition of stakeholders and its implementation of restoration activities.

Output 6 – Build capacity through provision of technical staff and guidelines that contribute to BRG’s technical capacity.

 ***Diagram 1. Theory of Change Phase II***

******

The Project Results Framework (Annex 1) defines the scope of activities the Project of both phases with Components 1-3 covering Phase I and components 4-6 covering Phase II.

The overall Project was designed and implemented as part of the exit strategy for the continuation of peat restoration efforts beyond 2020. The project was designed to provide BRG with the resources to coordinate and facilitate peat restoration and protection in the first-year priority provinces and move forward to other priority provinces without support from UNDP after 2018. BRG will have full capacity to carry over the activities under this project through a Project Management Unit or Government Mechanism.

## Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The main purpose of this evaluation was to systematically evaluate the relevance, performance, and success of the activities of the project over the two phases. The evaluation also examined the achievements, best practices, and lessons learned from the project, in order to provide inputs to improve project performance. This will help UNDP, BRG, responsible parties, and donors learn from the project, identify key areas which are replicable, and highlight the necessary conditions for sustainability.

The independent external evaluation was conducted by an expert evaluation team. The evaluation assessed the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the project and provided recommendations regarding performance and impact. The main stakeholders and partners of the project were consulted: namely BRG and KLKH, particularly the Directorate General for Law Enforcement, and the communities andCivil Society Organisations CSOs involved in peat restoration activities.

Knowledge and information obtained from the evaluation will be used as the basis for improved design and management of future UNDP activities related to environmental management and protection. The evaluation will also support public accountability of BRG, UNDP, and donors. The evaluation is expected to analyze the results achieved by the Project to inform the future evaluation of UNDP’s and the GOI’s CPAP 2016-2020.

## Evaluation Methodology and Approach

The methodological approach for data collection has been primarily qualitative in nature. Quantitative data has been drawn from project documents and reports and incorporated into the analysis. This evaluation complies with the United Nations’ system of evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The overall approach and methodology was based on the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating for Development ([*http://www*.undp.org/evaluation/handbook](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), pp. 172-177).

The terms of reference (ToR) include a whole list of questions to be addressed in the evaluation, corresponding to six evaluation criteria: *Relevance of the* *interventions; Validity and logic of the theory of change; Effectiveness of implementation; Effectiveness of management arrangements; Efficiency of resource use;* and *Sustainability.* Thesuggested questions and information needs have been incorporated in an evaluation matrix (see Annex II) with indicators to respond to them together with the information sources used for each evaluation question (EQ).

The independent evaluator team consists of a senior evaluator with over 30 years of experience in Indonesia implementing donor programmes, which includes UNDP Institutional support projects and environmental programmes. Furthermore, this senior evaluator has twenty years of experience evaluating technical cooperation projects as a national consultant and as a senior expert on implementing environmental programmes in Indonesia.

A master list of key evaluation questions contained within the terms of reference have been included in the Evaluation Matrix. This will serve as the basis for the development of the data collection tools. The evaluation matrix contains quantitative indicators coming from the programme’s logical framework (LF) and additional qualitative indicators complemented by the evaluation team.

The evaluation comprises the following data collection methods:

*1. Desk review:* Prior to commencing with the interviews, the independent evaluators reviewednumerous project-related documents covering the project background, design, and implementation. Below is a list of the documents:

* Baseline Reports
* UNPDF 2016 – 2020
* Project Document (Prodoc), Results and Resources Framework (RRF)
* Monitoring Reports
* Project Status Report
* Stakeholder Reports

*2. Sampling:* The sample was selected based on a rationale or purpose that is directly related to the evaluation purposes. It was intended to ensure accuracy in the interpretation of findings and usefulness of evaluation results. Stakeholders consulted included principal beneficiaries, UNDP staff and management, BRG, KLHK, Norwegian Embassy, Provincial TRG, and civil society partners.

*3. Interviews*: The evaluators have based the interviews on the interview template included in Annex II. Although questions look very detailed, the evaluators have adapted them and added additional questions that are consistent with the semi-structured nature of the interviews as appropriate. Emphases have varied and weight has been placed on specific questions in order to maximize the use of time. The use of common templates by both evaluators has ensured smooth coordination, comparability, and exchange of information.

*4. Triangulation:* Data collection methods have been triangulated. Considering the varietyof views and interests of stakeholders, clients and users of the evaluation, the stakeholders' perspectives have been triangulated for many of the evaluation questions in order to bolster the credibility and validity of the results.

*5. Field Visits:* Evaluation team members, mainly the National Consultant, visited Field sites (see Annex III).

## Achievements

### Outcome

When BRG was established it was tasked to restore more than two million hectares of damaged peatland. At the time, the agency was only provided with one Head, one Secretary, and four Deputies. As a result of the limited staff, it was very difficult for BRG to operate without a GOI-funded budget. Due to this, UNDP, funded by the Government of Norway, played a significant role in helping the agency evolve to become institutionally capable to undertake its mandate.

The ability of UNDP to fulfil BRG’s basic needs in its first year (2016) allowed the agency to move forward and deliver state budget to provinces, engage with communities and CSOs, and determine unit costs of peat restoration in 2017. BRG’s pivotal role in peatland restoration was established in 2018, as it was accepted and supported by communities, and was able to delegate its mandate to provincial governments. After two years, stakeholders are beginning to witness the impact of BRG. This success indicates that for the rest of BRG’s lifespan (until 2020), peat restoration will have been effective in the targeted provinces.

### Phase I (2016 – 2017)

**Output 1 – BRG is equipped with the necessary components that will make it an effective institution to deliver its mandates.**

* Adequate staff were provided to support administrative and technical matters for each of the four deputies, head, and secretary of BRG;
* Provincial Peat Restoration Team (Tim Restorasi Gambut Daerah – TRGD) was established in seven target provinces and began to plan peat restoration in the target provinces;
* BRG expert group (comprising 24 experts in peat restoration, water management, humanities, social work, and economics) was established and operationalized, providing inputs to KHLK on the revision of PP 71/2014 for peat restoration, as well as providing inputs for BRG peat restoration strategy and policy;
* BRG Working Units to manage administration and implementation of state budget were established, with 11 out of 13 units fully staffed during the first phase of the project;
* Equipment was provided to support daily working of staff;
* Office space was enhanced with additional space to accommodate the increased number of staff;
* A five-year strategic plan was developed to guide BRG in its responsibility to implement peat restoration;
* Peat ecosystem restoration plans (Rencana Restorasi Ekosistem Gambut – RREG) were developed. The plans explained the specific location of peat hydrological units (Kesatuan Hidrologi Gambut – KHG) in all seven targeted provinces, describing their condition and function, and detailing any intervention to be undertaken to restore these KHGs;
* By providing adequate staff and resources, BRG was eligible for a state-funded budget. By the end of 2016, BRG was granted a total of IDR 24 Billion (USD 1.8 Million) in state funding for the last quarter of 2016. State funding increased significantly to IDR 865 Billion (USD 64 Million) in 2017;
* To implement the strategic plan, BRG developed six technical and policy guidelines that were used as a reference for peatland rehabilitation activities on the ground. They were as follows:
	+ Technical guideline on rewetting developed: construction of deep wells, construction of canal blocking;
	+ Technical guideline on re-vegetation developed: seeding, nursery, and plantation;
	+ Technical guideline on revitalization of community livelihood developed;
	+ Policy guideline on social safeguard developed;
	+ Technical guideline on monitoring the peat damage through the movement of water levels developed;
	+ Technical guideline on student field work (Kuliah Kerja Nyata – KKN) on peat care village (Desa peduli gambut – DGS) developed;
* To ensure transparency and accountability of its actions, BRG established a website and social media platforms to enable people to access information about BRG’s activities and achievements;
* A complaint mechanism was developed in Phase I and was completed in Phase II of the Project.

**Output 2 – BRG’s inputs for the revision of Government Regulation No 71 Year 2014 on Peat Ecosystem Protection and Management is in place followed by the drafting of relevant ministerial regulations or decrees.**

* In cooperation with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, The Government Regulation No 71, Year 2014, was revised to form Government Regulation No 57 Year 2016. The new regulation emphasizes a moratorium on all land clearing in peatlands until the government stipulates protection and cultivation zones in peat ecosystems for certain plants. The stipulation will be detailed in a future Ministerial Decree. The revised regulation also emphasizes inclusive peat restoration that involves all stakeholders, particularly the community surrounding peatlands;
* Following the revision, BRG has set up a legal team to analyse existing regulations that may prove contradictory to Regulation No. 57/2016 and are currently formulating recommendations on how to amend these regulations;
* BRG also conducted legal analyses and provided legal options to license holders that contribute to fire outbreaks in BRG targeted peatland restoration locations.

**Output 3 – The peat restoration implementation models are in place and serve as key reference for peat restoration undertaken by central government, sub-national governments, or partners.**

* BRG contributed to drafting ministerial decree on peat hydrological areas;
* Five pilot activities were undertaken at national level universities (UGM and IPB), local universities (Universitas Riau and Universitas Palangkaraya), and CSOs (WALHI), which included the following:
	+ Mapping of the canals and areas affected by canals in seven provinces, conducted in collaboration with UGM;
	+ Action research on community-based peat restoration in Tebing Tinggi Timur Sub-district, Riau, conducted in collaboration with the Centre for Disaster Study (Pusat Studi Bencana – PSB), Riau University;
	+ Peat-friendly cow cattle assessment in Pulang Pisau District, Central Kalimantan, in collaboration with Bogor Agricultural Institute (IPB), and Palangkaraya University;
	+ Peat-friendly cow cattle management in Pulang Pisau, a follow-up of the above assessment;
	+ Comprehensive Peat Restoration Modeling in Pulau Padang Sub-district, Riau, in collaboration with UGM.

### Phase II (2017 – 2018)

**Output 4 – BRG’s core institutional support functions and peatland operational equipment is established**.

* The enactment of Ministry of Environment and Forestry Regulation No. P.61/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/11/2017 on delegation of several Central Government on Environment and Forestry tasks on Peat Restoration to the Governors of Riau, Jambi, South Sumatera, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan, and Papua. This was followed up by development of technical and implementation guidelines and agreement between BRG and provincial governments, which enables BRG to disburse IDR 240 Billion (or USD $20 Million) of state budget and significantly increases the participation of sub-national governments in managing peat restoration;
* Facilitated dialogue between the BRG and Directorate General for Natural Resources Conservation and Ecosystem to develop an agreement on implementation of peat restoration efforts. This led to the establishment of DG-Natural Resources Conservation and Ecosystem Technical Unit Offices in each of the five locations, thereby enabling BRG to disburse its budget through government counterparts;
* Established a Command Center at BRG Office, which allowed BRG to develop an Information System that supported BRG’s internal work activities, coordination functions among stakeholders, monitor progress of peat restoration, and help senior management in decision making;
* Established a Command Center at the Directorate General (DG) of Law Enforcement at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) Office. The Center will become the main entry point for coordination between BRG and KLHK and is now operational. SOPs for the Centre were developed and Inspectors will be trained in 2019 using KLKH APBN funding in 2019. Operations rooms (opsroom) were requested in Palembang, Pontianik, and Manokwari. The opsroom was completed in Palembang and was supplied with a complete set of equipment, while the Pontianak Opsroom was refurbished and only partially fitted out. The Manokwari Opsroom was not developed due to insufficient time to complete within the UNDP contract timeline;
* An expert team was established to review and recommend changes in government regulations, state budget utilization, internal and external coordination, partnership and participation.

**Output 5 – Strengthen BRG’s engagement with a wide coalition of stakeholders and its implementation of restoration activities.**

* BRG mapping and planning has improved by providing specific technical staff, which has enabled BRG to develop appropriate annual plans rather than contingency plans;
* Mobilizing Provincial Governments’ participation in peatland restoration by providing a consultant to prepare the necessary precondition’s for this participation. For example, a coordination mechanism and guideline for the implementation of Peat Restoration in seven provinces was developed;
* Mobilizing community participation in peatland restoration by providing a special task force to conduct training on peat rewetting and revegetation infrastructure development for community groups;
* Piloting peat restoration model at KHG level in Pulau Padang. This is still being implemented and is progressing according to plans in all villages.

**Output 6 – Build capacity through provision of technical staff and guidelines that contribute to BRG’s technical capacity.**

* Acquiring BRG’s commitment for supporting tropical peatland restoration through a roundtable meeting involving the International Peatland Society and Japan Peatland Society;
* Establishment of a dedicated communications team to enhance BRG communication strategy, ensuring more support from stakeholders.

### Contracts

In just over 24 months, UNDP has finalised over 1,000 contracts ranging in size from USD $14 to USD $112,186 (Table 1). In the first quarter alone, over 160 purchase orders were finalised by the UNDP procurement team.

Table 1. Number of goods, recruitment and events/workshops contracted by UNDP for BRG 2016 to 2018

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Number** |
| Goods | 740 |
| Recruitment  | 184 |
| Events/Workshops | 315 |

UNDP used its fast-tracking procedures in 2016 and 2017 to ensure a timely response to BRG requests. For example, this meant the RFP advertising period was reduced from 2-3 weeks down to one week. The country office had delegation procurement authority to approve up to USD $500,000 in the first year, USD $300,000 in the second year before returning to USD $150,000 in 2018.

### Recruitment

UNDP recruited about 30 staff members to support project implementation. These staff members ranged in skills and competency from SC1 to SC 9 depending on the Project’s requirements.

## Findings and Conclusions

### Relevance

The Project was highly relevant in supporting BRG and was pivotal to the implementation of the Presidential Regulation on the Establishment of BRG (No 1/2016). The project enabled BRG to quickly establish and implement its program in line with the regulation and the Renstra (action plan) developed by BRG.

The Project was also in line with the UN Country strategy, the UNPDF 2016-2020, in supporting Outcome 3, whereby Indonesia in 2020 “is sustainably managing its natural resources on land, and at sea, with increased resilience to the effects of climate change, disasters and other shocks.” The Project was implemented in line with UNDP policies, especially with respect to environmental and social guidelines. The Direct Implementation Modality was an appropriate choice for implementing the project.

The Kingdom of Norway’s investment in Indonesia included supporting the Government of Indonesia to develop policies for long-term peatland management. The investment for UNDP was in response to the Government of Indonesia’s request to support the newly established agency. Norway provided support to a range of other stakeholders as part of an overall investment to help the Government of Indonesia implement the Presidential Regulation. The investment through UNDP was highly relevant and targeted to enable BRG to lead the development of the Agency, while UNDP provided immediate support to help the organisation grow from an initial mobilisation of six staff and undertake essential procurement while waiting for the Government of Indonesia’s funding to be made available to the Agency. In 2016, BRG received its budget in November of the same year. Apart from UNDP, the Government of Norway’s funding support to BRG was through other agencies, such as FAO, WRI, and Kemitraan.

### Validity and logic of the theory of change

The Theory of Change was appropriate in the context of UNDP’s support to BRG in that it demonstrates the appropriate input of key resources—i.e., recruiting staff, providing equipment, supporting stakeholders, and providing resources to support the development of guidelines and polices, and enabling BRG to implement its mandate in 2016. This evaluation has found this to be the case. As BRG was responsible for implementing the Presidential Regulation, it required critical support to mobilize resources that are readily available in Indonesia but can be challenging to acquire in a timely manner through APBN budget availability. Although the Theory of Change and results framework were not fully understood by all stakeholders, many clearly understood the structure and allocation of resources of the different resources across the two phases.

The timelines to meet the planned objectives and outputs were appropriate. However, there was a high expectation for UNDP to deliver a large number of contracts in the first six months of the Project, which should have been considered unrealistic. It was also during this period that UNDP had to recruit and mobilize its own procurement and administration team to process the significant number of requests from BRG.

The Project was divided into two phases mainly due to uncertainty of implementation arrangements, and BRG’s continued needs after the first phase. This appears to have impacted the continuum of the delivery of services.

The mainstreaming of gender was not clearly articulated in the Project document. However, revisions to the Project Document in 2017 enabled the Project to consider the gender mainstreaming and representation in the project implementation. This was mainly integrated into community activities, where the roles of men and women in managing the peatlands were assessed. However, the evaluation team did not identify any negative impact towards women in the implementation of activities. The BRG model on Comprehensive Peat Restoration, piloted in Pulau Padang, Riau Province, is an example of women’s involvement in peatland restoration. This pilot has been able to map the division of labour between men and women. Men were mainly involved in the management of sago plantations, while women were engaged in the downstream processing of sago flour and foods.

Gender mainstreaming could have been better managed from the onset of the Project, as it was only in 2018 that UNDP mobilized a gender safeguards consultant for BRG to better mainstream gender issues within their overall program.

### Effectiveness of implementation

Implementation was assessed to be effective overall. The support provided to BRG was appropriate. Over two years, it enabled BRG to grow from a very small organization to a fully functioning agency with significant national government funding. UNDP’s support enabled both BRG and KLHK to procure equipment and services that would have been difficult to procure under government procurement regulations in a short time frame. The achievements highlighted above demonstrate the value of this support.

UNDP support to KLHK was significant in developing a command Centre for Law Enforcement. Using UNDP procurement procedures, appropriate equipment and software could be supplied to the Ministry. This procurement process was seen by KLHK as highly effective, as GOI procurement procedures that require the cheapest price would have resulted in suboptimal equipment being installed. KLHK now has a fully functional Command Centre at the national level and a functional facility in Palembang. The final functionality of the Pontianak Opsroom is uncertain while the Manokwari facility may require APBN financing. The challenge now with UNDP’s contract being completed is the uncertainty regarding the formal transfer of assets through the BAST process.

The BAST process is the formal hand over of assets to the Government of Indonesia Asset Register to enable ongoing operation and maintenance through APBN budget processes. For KLHK assets, this requires documentation of assets purchased by UNDP through the Norwegian grant in accordance with the Ministry of Finance procedures. For assets supplied by the grant, they need to be documented on the Ministry’s asset register to ensure the budget can be provided to operate and maintain the system, as well as further enhance the system in the future as changes are needed. As the grantee is BRG, the BAST asset transfer is further complicated. This may impact the ongoing and future sustainability of the Centres and Opsrooms in Pontianak and Palembang. It is uncertain as to whether or not future grant funds will be made available for the Manokwari Opsroom.

The engagement of NGOs to support BRG activities in the field was very effective. The NGOs were able to establish pilot activities and implement a wide range of interventions, including drilling deep wells and setting up demonstrations. Through the provision of no-cost extensions over the life of the Project, NGOs were able to implement their agreed upon work plan. Although the NGO grant activities were able to generally meet their agreed outputs in the limited time available, more effective outcomes would have been achieved through a longer timeframe. It is now up to BRG to continue supporting the NGOs through APBN funding.

### Effectiveness of management arrangements

Management arrangements were generally assessed as good. The Programme Manager, Dr Abdul Situmorang, played a key role in liaising with the key stakeholders, namely BRG, KLHK, and the Embassy of Norway. UNDP management team effectively monitored all activities and responded in a timely manner to requests from BRG through the PMU.

The Project Board met in November 2016 and was consulted throughout 2017. A final Project board meeting was held in September 2017. The Project Board members were kept informed as to progress through the Quarterly Progress Reports and annual reports. The Kingdom of Norway was regularly updated as to any potential issues.

### Efficiency of resource use

Resources were very appropriately used. UNDP was able to manage the budget (Table 2) in a timely way and ensure expenditure was in line with the overall strategy. In 2017, there were delays in procurement that were reprogrammed in the 2018 budget.

Table 2 Budget against expenditure per annum

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Year** | **Expense + Full Asset Cost + Commitment**[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| 1 | 2016 | 1,886,661.50 |
| 2 | 2017 | 2,622,098.22 |
| 3 | 2018 | 6,537,524.67 |
| **Total** | **11,046,284.40** |

Total Funds Available 2016-2018: **11,143,204**

Total Estimated Expenditures 2016-2018: **11,046,284.40**

Overall Implementation Rate: **99%**

UNDP resources to provide support were efficiently used, as they were integrated within UNDP’s existing procurement systems to minimize duplication of resources. UNDP recruited two staff to manage the procurement process to ensure all procurement was undertaken in line with UNDP procedures, while at the same time meeting BRG requirements to have services and goods delivered in a timely manner. UNDP staff met PMU and BRG staff on a regular basis to make sure all procurement met stakeholders’ expectations.

### Sustainability

UNDP’s support was completed in 2018, and is considered sustainable in terms of enabling BRG to continue to effectively operate until 2020. Through the support by providing essential equipment, recruiting staff, and contracting NGOs, BRG will be able to continue implementing its activities post-UNDP support through APBN funding. Through this initial support, it is expected that the Government of Indonesia will be able to develop appropriate policies and practices for the sustainable management of Indonesia’s peatlands by the end of 2020.

The ongoing NGO support post-UNDP is uncertain, which will impact the sustainability of many of the activities that have been undertaken. The development of alternative livelihoods to replace palm oil is uncertain as the replacement crops (pineapples and ginger) have poor market opportunities. BRG will need to ensure that APBN funding is available to sustain these activities and transition to longer term interventions, most likely implemented by Provincial and District agencies. The new regulation that enables the government to easily grant funding to NGOs through self-management, or swakalola[[2]](#footnote-2), will allow NGO grants to be continued without too much difficulty as long as there is government commitment.

## General Recommendations

As peat restoration efforts continue beyond 2020, Provincial governments are expected to continue these programs with APBD funding. To ensure this happens, the legal framework for confirming the Provincial government’s role should be finalised. Therefore, it is recommended that by the end of BRG’s mandate the national government should have prepared the policy reform that enables peat restoration work to be mainstreamed in the provincial government’s priority programs, especially for the seven provinces with peatlands.

Drafting and improving the clarity of regulations has been critical to the success of peatland restoration. The process of producing regulations required a significant amount of time and money. Through the project’s support, an important regulation on environment protection, especially peatland, was accelerated in its promulgation. The project also supported the development of related regulations, through MOUs between BRG and provincial level institutions—i.e., universities and CSOs.

The UNDP DIM modality is highly relevant for these types of activities, as it allows UNDP to quickly mobilize resources to meet the needs of an immediate response when coupled with UNDP’s fast-tracking procedures.

UNDP requires mechanisms to quickly source independent consultants to ensure that the consultant recruitment processes can be quickly implemented.

Use of UNDP Social and Environmental Standards to assess all activities was highly appropriate and minimized the likelihood of any potential environmental and social risks.

## Specific Recommendations for Replication within Existing Government Institutions and Programmes

In the future, UNDP should develop a Financial Management Information System (FMIS) that can enable Government Partners to monitor expenditures against budgets. Financial information from UNDP’s Enterprise Resource Planning System, ATLAS, should be able to be readily transferred to a simple FMIS that Government counterparts can readily monitor against the agreed budget. UNDP has been able to do this in previous projects by developing a simple excel spreadsheet that records expenditures against budgets and variances against budgets. Expenditure is recorded at different stages from initiation of requests, contracting, and actual expenditure. The FMIS could be available in real-time to Government counterparts through a shared drive using an application like Google Docs. The information is password protected and only assigned UNDP staff have the authority to update the spreadsheet after consultation with the implementing agency. Realignment of the budget can occur with regular meetings with the BRG leadership group.

Operating guidelines on UNDP procurement processes, especially for contracting companies, should be developed to enable partnering Government agencies to fully understand the strengths and weaknesses of UNDP procurement policies. The guidelines should be simple and should highlight the key requirements UNDP requires in order to fast-track a streamlined procurement process, thereby minimising delays. For example, the guidelines should lay out the minimal timelines to contract a company to deliver goods or services (with respect to the minimum number of days a tender can be advertised), the need for at least three competitive quotes ensuring value for money, and the required specifications (scope of services) to ensure a successful tender outcome that can meet UNDP’s review and approval processes.

The UNDP Procurement Plan is a dynamic document in Projects/Programmes that requires immediate support to help newly defined organisations to be established. The Procurement Plan needs to be regularly discussed with all stakeholders to ensure all parties are aware of the status of any requests (developing scope of services, tendering, generating Purchase Orders, and closure).

Equipment procured for BRG and KLHK needs to be fully transferred from UNDP to the respective agency through the BAST process. All documentation must be compliant with Ministry of Finance guidelines for transferring assets purchased through grants. If assets are not registered on the BRG and KLHK asset registry, there may be problems requesting APBN budget to operate and maintain these systems. UNDP has recruited an adviser to ensure the timely transfer of all UNDP purchased assets are transferred to BRG. This process could have been streamlined if a duplicate asset registry was established by BRG. This duplicate registry should include all information required by the BAST process in order to facilitate transfer from UNDP to BRG.

## Lessons Learned

Supporting newly established organizations like BRG requires appropriate levels of support from procurement and HR teams to ensure resources are mobilized in a timely manner. Support is required to draft and finalize scope of services, Terms of Reference, tendering, and finalizing all documentation to meet UNDP operational guidelines. For technical procurement, there should be some flexibility in order to recruit additional capacity. UNDP provided dedicated procurement staff to facilitate this process.

Due to budget limitations, UNDP could only recruit recent graduates at the SC1 and SC2 level for many of the administrative positions. Although the staff were highly motivated, they needed time to be fully inducted into understanding UNDP systems, as they had no prior expertise with UNDP systems and policies.

Fast-track “surge capacity” enabled UNDP to procure most requests from BRG in a timely manner. The ability of UNDP to fast-track procurement and support from UNDP regional offices and headquarters facilitated the timely mobilization of resources.

There are two factors determining UNDP’s success in supporting the agency. *First,* UNDP has experience providing first-hand support to newly established agencies. The most recent experience was with the REDD+ Agency[[3]](#footnote-3), and previously the institutional readiness of the Aceh Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Agency established after the 2004 tsunami. *Second*, UNDP has an established system that can deliver rapid support (recruitment, procurement, financial, and monitoring systems) in a short amount of time, while simultaneously upholding transparency and ensuring the efficiency and effectiveness of the supported program. UNDP has equipped BRG with adequate technical and administrative staff, experts, and equipment, which then led to the development of maps and planning documents that served as a basis in determining restoration location and planning.

The ability of UNDP to fulfil BRG’s basic needs in its first year (2016) allowed the agency to move forward and deliver a state budget to provinces, engage with communities and CSOs, and determine unit cost of peat restoration in 2017. BRG’s pivotal role in peatland restoration was established in 2018 as it was accepted and supported by communities, and was able to delegate its mandate to provincial governments. After two years, stakeholders are beginning to witness the impact of BRG. This success indicates that for the rest of BRG’s lifespan (until 2020), peat restoration will have been effective in the targeted provinces.

At the beginning of its establishment, BRG struggled with access to data. Mapping target areas were among its first priority, however, data was unavailable because it was decentralized and held by various government institutions. UNDP facilitated improved data sharing among owners, allowing for discussions and sharing of results with BRG. This provided BRG with an valuable lesson about the importance of knowledge sharing and management. In the future, there should be a proper and consistent knowledge sharing and management strategy prepared from the beginning.

BRG has been able to develop models for peat restoration that include all aspects of the restoration process—i.e., rewetting, revegetation, and revitalization of livelihoods. From this model, BRG learned that in addition to KHGs, a smaller unit of peatland, the sub-KHG, should also be counted. Expanding the peat restoration unit to the sub-KHG level will help BRG to determine zones in a more precise manner. BRG has also learned the importance of complete data gathering. This is to ensure precise measurement, as there are two patterns of ground water level intervals following the two seasons in Indonesia—dry and wet season—which empirically shows consistency and water levels during both seasons.

Above all, a support facility project takes time and resources to establish a new institution. The government established BRG with detailed tasks, whilst not also providing the necessary tools to achieve these tasks. These tools include: an organizational structure, remuneration system, operational capabilities, and access to finance. In the future, establishing a new institution or programme should be prepared with an inclusive staff structure, remuneration, access to state financing, and other inherent resources. A newly established institution or programme can then start preparing its strategic and action plans and/or immediately begin to implement its mandate. This will save resources and time spent in the first year to establish institutional readiness.

## Annexes

### Annex 1 Project Results Framework

### Annex II Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  EQ 2 VALIDITY AND LOGIC OF THE THEORY OF CHANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 Do all stakeholders understand the theory of change? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 2.2 Were time frames realistic regarding planned objectives and outputs? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 2. 3 Were the projects’ designs logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders? | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| 2. 4 How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project monitoring and evaluation plan in assessing the project’s progress at output and outcome levels? | x | x | x |  | x |  |
| 2. 5 Did the project design adequately consider the gender dimension of the planned interventions?  | x | x | x |  | x | x |
| * 1. What has been achieved and has this been done right? (Were stated outputs and outcomes achieved and were they done effectively and efficiently? Can success, or lack of it, be attributable to the project’s design, theory of change and implementation logic?)
	2. Have the right things been done? (Were the activities, outputs and the outcomes relevant, appropriate and strategic to development priorities, national goals and UNDP’s mandate?)
 | x | x | x | x | x | x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EQ 3 IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1. To what extent is the Project being effective in promoting its mandate, in supporting BRG?  | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 3.2. To what extent has the project been making sufficient progress towards its planned results? Will the project be likely to achieve its agenda goal by the end of the project?  | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 3.3. To what extent has the support effectively mainstreamed gender in project strategies and interventions? Could you please elaborate? | x | x | x |  | x | x |
| * 1. Has the project properly addressed crosscutting issues (like gender)? How might we do things better in the future?
 | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| 3.5 What have been the benefits of the projects on individuals (men and women), institutions and the enabling environment? | x | x | x |  |  |  |
| * 1. Have the right things been done with the right people and partners? (Has the partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?)
 | x | x | x | x |  |  |
| EQ 4 EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1. Do you think cooperation between project staff and UNDP officials was effective What about communication between UNDP and the donor, Was it effective? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 4.1.2. Do you think Management capacities were adequate for the achievement of the project’s aims? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 4.2. To what extent are the effectiveness project’s governance structures to achieve the project goal? | x | x | x | x |  |  |
| x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EQ 5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.1 Do you think resources have been used efficiently? Why? Could you please specify by funds, human resources, time and expertise? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 5.2. What is the budget delivery up until now? Is there any specific activity or need you could not cover with the funds? Were specific constraints for budget spending? | x | x | x | x |  |  |
| 5.3. What type of synergies has been created with other projects? How would you rate the efficiency of that cooperation? Did Projects have taken into account products, evaluations and lessons learned from previous projects and UNDP initiatives in this field of intervention? Why so? | x | x | x | x |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EQ6 SUSTAINABILITY AND REPLICABILITY  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.1. How likely are the projects’ achievements to be sustainable? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 6.2. How effective has the project been in establishing national/local ownership? Are the linkages to broader sectoral and national action been made | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 6.3. Is the phase-out strategy for the project in place and under implementation? Is it sufficiently clearly articulated and progress made towards this goal? | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| 6.4 Are the results sustainable? (Will the results be sustained by the beneficiaries and will they lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?) | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| * 1. What should we continue doing, what is replicable or can be scaled up, and how might we do things better in the future? (What lessons and findings are relevant for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?)
 | x | x | x | x | x | x |

### Annex III List of Respondents, Contact Details and Topics Discussed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Christophe Bahuet

UNDP Indonesia Country Director  | Appointment via his secretary: Pramudita Lestari (Dita) pramudita.lestari@undp.org>  | * Project Strategic contributions to BRG Institutional setup
* UNDP roles
 | * 17th September
 |
| 1. Budhi Sayoko

Head of Environment Unit  | budhi.sayoko@undp.org  | * Key achievements, challenges and programmatic approach
 | * 17th September
 |
| 1. Abdul Wahib Situmorang

Natural Resources Governance Adviser  | abdul.situmorang@undp.org  | * Key achievements, challenges and key recommendations
 | * 4th October
 |
| 1. John Benjamin

Head of Procurement Unit  | yusef.millah@undp.org | * Number of goods and services procured
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * The meeting was also attended by Ferdyani Putri
* 25th September
 |
| 1. Astiti Sukatrilaksana

Head of HR Unit  | astiti.sukatrilaksana@undp.org | * Number of SC recruited
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 3rd October
 |
| **BRG-THE PEATLAND RESTORATION AGENCY**  |  |
| 1. Nazir Foead

Head of BRG  | nazir.foead@gmail.com0811977604  | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup and worked on the ground
* His perceptions on UNDP support
 | * 19th September
 |
| 1. Hartono

BRG Secretary/NPD  | hprawiratmadja@gmail.com08129770717 | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup and worked on the ground
* BRG Support Facility support to his roles and tasks
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 24th September
 |
| 1. Budi Wardana

Deputy 1  | budi.wardhana@brg.go.id08119933117  | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup and worked on the ground
* BRG Support Facility support to his roles and tasks
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 18th September
 |
| 1. Myrna Savitri

Deputy 3 | myrna.safitri@brg.go.id0816861372 | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup and worked on the ground
* BRG Support Facility support to his roles and tasks
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 18th September
 |
| 1. Didy Wurdjanto

Dir-Planning and Budgeting  | dwurjanto77@gmail.com08128265536  | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup and worked on the ground
* BRG Support Facility support to his roles and tasks
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 17th September
 |
| Norway Embassy  |  |
| 1. Øyvind Dahl

Counselor  | Oyvind.Dahl@mfa.no | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup
* Key contributions to Norway ambition on climate change
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 3rd October
 |
| 1. Susilo Ady Kuncoro

Adviser  | Susilo.Ady.KUNCORO@mfa.no | * Key impacts to BRG institutional setup
* Key contributions to Norway ambition on climate change
* Speed, efficiency and value for money
 | * 3rd October
 |
| DG Law Enforcement-LHK  |  |
| 1. Damayanti Nadia Syifa

Head of Planning and Budgeting  | damanadia@yahoo.com | * Key achievement for Ops-room development project
 | * 19th September
 |
|  |  |  |  |
| NGO’s  |
| 1. Riko and Fandi WALHI Riau
 | Riko (0813 71302269), Fandi (085271603790) | * Relevance, efficiency and sustainability, and lesson learned from project and working with UNDP.
* Key impacts the project to community.
 | * 20 September
 |
| 1. Andi Yayasan Mitra Insani
 | 0852 713 77899 | * Relevance, efficiency and sustainability, and lesson learned from project and working with UNDP.
* Key impacts the project to community.
 | * 20th September
 |
| 1. M. Syarifudin Perkumpulan Tanah Air – PETA Sumatera Selatan
 | 0812 7340 0737 | * Key impacts to community and grantee.
* Appropriateness, efficiency and sustainability
 | * 17th September
 |
|  |  |  |  |
| RG Province |
| 1. Dhio Dhani Sineba, Dinamisator BRG Provinsi Sumsel
 | 081368633608 | * Relevance, appropriateness and efficiency.
* Lesson learned from the project.
 | * 18th September
 |
| 1. DR. Najib Asmani dan Pak Hadi, TRGD Provinsi Sumsel
 | 0811 715 025 | * Relevance, effectiveness and lesson learned
 | * 18th September
 |
| 1. Muslim Rasyid, Dinamisator BRG Provinsi Riau
 | 0812 7637 233 | * Relevance, appropriateness and efficiency.
* Lesson learned from the project.
 | * 19 September
 |
| 1. Risda, TRGD province Riau
 | 0852 7137 7899 | * Relevance and lesson learned from the project.
 | * 19 September
 |
| 1. Riko Kurniawan and Pendi, WALHI Riau
 | 0813 71302269 | * Key impact to community and grantee.
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 20 September
 |
| 1. Andi, Yayasan Mitra Insani
 | 0852 713 77899 | * Key impact to community and grantee.
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 20 September
 |
| 1. Ella Lovianti, TRGD Jambi (Female)
 | 0813 732 87417 | * Key impact to TRGD
* Lesson learned and recommendation to next projects.
 | * 26 September
 |
| 1. Syaiful and Hambali
 | Pak Hambali (0813 1470 7650/Direktur) - Syaiful (0853 8471 0924/Koordinator program) | * Relevance and appropriateness
* Key impact to community and grantee.
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | 27 September |
| 1. Pak Sukriyah (Ketua POKMAS Sumber Bakti), Pak Sanusi (Anggota), Pak Sutrisno (Bendahara POKMAS) dan Ibu Antona (Istri Pak Sanusi, Umur 38 tahun) Community of Rantau Indah Village, Tanjung Jabung Timur - Jambi
 | Pak Sukriyah (0852 6884 3848) | * Relevance and appropriateness
* Key impact to community
* Key impact to women
* Lesson learned
 | * 27th September
 |
| 1. Syamsul Asinar, Konsultan Sekolah Lapang, South Sumatra
 | 0812 8713 7276 | * Lesson learned from the project
* Impact to community
 | * 29th October
 |
| 1. Lelly and Ridho Faizadi (Female), Yayasan gemawan – West Kalimantan
 | 0813 4522 5232 | * Key impact to community and grantee.
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 3rd October
 |
| 1. Wawan (Dinamisator BRG West Kalimantan)
 | 0812 5704959 | Key impact to community.Key lesson learned from UNDP’s project | * 3rd October
 |
| 1. Surahman, Sutarman, Ibu Henny (LPPKM – Universitas Tanjung Pura) – West Kalimantan
 | Ibu Henny – 0812 98693663 | * Key impact to community and grantee.
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 4th October
 |
| 1. Joko Waluyo,Dinamisator BRG
 | 0811 845 648 | * Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project.
 | * 4th October
 |
| 1. Mastuati, Lembaga Dayat Panarung
 | 0813 5155 8868 | * Key impact to community and grantee
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 5th October
 |
| 1. Dwi Dedeh – Fasilitator peternakan BRG
 | 0822 5553 3143 | * Key impact to community and grantee
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 5th October
 |
| 1. Patmawati, ELPAM
 | 0821 5901 4743 | * Key impact to community and grantee
* Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 5th October
 |
| 1. Aswin Yusuf, LPPM Universitas Palangkaraya
 | 0822 5429 7627 | * Sustainability and replicability.
* Key lesson learned from the project
 | * 5th October
 |
| 1. Tri Miniarti – TRGD Provinsi Kalteng
 | 0812 5061 4010 | * Relevance and appropriateness
* Key lesson learned from UNDP project.
 | * 6th October
 |
| 1. Abdullah Unjung, Sekretaris Desa, Desa Tanjung Taruna – Kabupaten Pulang Pisau
 |  | * Key impact to community
* Lesson learned from UNDP project
 | * 6th October
 |
| 1. Pak Muhyar - Ibu Mariyana, Ibu Norhayati, Irawan, Hermanto dan Penyang
 | Pak Muhyar – 0853 93380031 | * Key impact the project to community
* Key lesson learned
 | * 6th October
 |
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