



**Notes of Online Meeting
National Steering Committee GEF/SGP Indonesia
Wednesday, 16 March 2022**

I. Member of National Steering Committee (Online) :

1. Mr. Agus Prabowo – UNDP
2. Mr. Anton Sri Probiyantono – UNDP
3. Ms. Elin Shinta – UNDP
4. Ms. Noni Eko Rahayu – Ministry of Environment and Forestry
5. Ms. Laura Reviani Bestari – Ministry of Environment and Forestry
6. Ms. Yani Witjaksono – Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan
7. Mr. Mathias Ola – Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan
8. Mr. Heru D Wardhana – PT. Martina Bertho, Tbk
9. Ms. Briggita Dewanti - PT. Martina Bertho, Tbk
10. Mr. Prof. Dr. Ir. Purwanto DEA - Komite Nasional MAB-UNESCO, BRIN
11. Ms. Latipah Hendarti – Yayasan Detara
12. Ms. Julia Kalmirah – World Research Institute (WRI) Indonesia

II. Member of NSC who unable to attend:

1. Ms. Laksmi Dhewanthi – Ministry of Forestry and Environment
2. Mr. Zainal Arifin – LIPI- Oceanography
3. Ms. Brigitta Isworo – KOMPAS
4. Ms. Ikatri Meynar Sihombing - Microfinance Expert
5. Mr. Fransiskus Welirang - Bogasari

III. GEF/SGP Indonesia Secretariat:

1. Ms. Catharina Dwihastarini (National Coordinator)
2. Mr. Hery Budiarto (Program Assistant/Finance Officer)
3. Ms. Meinar Sapto Wulan (Program Assistant)

IV. Agenda

1. Reporting and discussion of Terminal Evaluation result
2. Reporting and discussion of Internal Audit result
3. Discussion of GEF SGP closing event program that will be held on March 30- April 1, 2022 and Agreement of Closing Event committee.

V. Discussion:

1. Reporting and discussion of Terminal Evaluation result

Ms. Catharina Dwihastarini, as the National Coordinator opened the meeting and appreciated the NSC who attended. She also thanked all NSCs for being resource persons and involved in the

implementation of the Terminal Evaluation. Mrs. Catharina also apologized to the NSC members who were unable to be resource persons at the previous Terminal Evaluation. She informed that Mr. Fransiskus Welirang was unable to attend because of conflicting time with the meeting with the Ministry of Industry. Mr. Franky conveyed his input that the achievements of the GEF SGP OP6 should be linked to the goals of the SDGs.

The achievements of GEF SGP OP-6 that have been produced so far are:

| Indicator | Cumulative progress since project start |
|--|--|
| Community-Based Projects | Supported : 95 Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75 Small Grant Projects • 2 Strategic projects (landscape strategies and exit strategies (<u>Terasmitra</u>)) • 18 Knowledge Management Projects Total Grants: USD 2,544,251 |
| Increased area of sustainably managed production integrating biodiversity conservation in one forested and three coastal landscapes | Marine Community Conservation Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 local community-based projects • 75,423.97 hectares of marine community conservation areas. Forest Community Conservation Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37 community-based projects • 53,688.41 ha : the reforestation and farmer-managed natural regeneration • 5,162.58 hectares : the plantation of trees/bushes • 42,188.354 hectares: turning agricultural lands into agro-ecological practices • 50 demonstration-scale <u>silvo-pastoral</u> systems. |
| Increased number of producers participating in community based adaptive landscape planning and management in one forested and three coastal landscapes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 CBOs and 51 NGOs • a total 11,092 beneficiaries • 54 percent are women. |
| Increased number of R/E application | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 614 fuel efficient stoves • 3 <u>micro/pico</u> hydro units • 5 biogas units • 261 units (156,5% of the target) of solar panel |

1. Terminal Evaluation Results:

Concise summary of findings:

- a. The project is highly relevant for the country because it has an integrated approach that contributes to the different programs in the country such as land reforestation, climate change adaptation, and social forestry.
- b. The project design was weak; although it was guided by the global logical framework of SGP projects, it would be expected to be adequately articulated to the national context and policies.
- c. The adaptive management of the project is noteworthy; on the one hand, it is appreciated that the Project Management Unit (PMU) decided to follow a landscape approach to fill the gap of not having a ProDoc as a guide for its implementation. Likewise, the management of COVID-19 was adequate.

- d. The project was able to fulfil all the indicators of its two components. In some cases, it even exceeded the planned target by a significant margin. In some cases, it is important to mention, the goal was achieved thanks to cooperation with other programs such as RARE¹.
- e. The project contributed to the strengthening and transfer of technologies; however, the sustainability perspectives are uncertain as there are not formal institutional commitments or budgets allocated to maintain most of the projects.

Synthesis of the key lessons learned:

- a. Relatively small investments can make an important difference in terms of improving quality of life in rural vulnerable communities.
- b. Working through host organizations in each region allowed a more organized and strategic intervention because they played a critical role landing technologies and practices to the local context.
- c. Productive activities should have a consistent approach towards generating entrepreneurial, organizational and business capacities, not only to sell products but also to sell the knowledge acquired.

Evaluation Rating Table

| Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) | Rating |
|---|-----------------------------|
| M&E design at entry | 4 (Moderately Satisfactory) |
| M&E Plan Implementation | 4 (Moderately Satisfactory) |
| Overall Quality of M&E | 4 (Moderately Satisfactory) |
| Implementation & Execution | Rating |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Overall quality of Implementation/Execution | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Assessment of Outcomes | Rating |
| Relevance | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Effectiveness | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Efficiency | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating | 5 (Satisfactory) |
| Sustainability | Rating |
| Financial resources | 2 (Moderately Unlikely) |
| Socio-political/economic | 3 (Moderately Likely) |
| Institutional framework and governance | 2 (Moderately Unlikely) |
| Environmental | 3 (Moderately Likely) |
| Overall Likelihood of Sustainability | 3 (Moderately Likely) |

Recommendation and Management Response

| |
|---|
| A. Project Design |
| Terminal Evaluation recommendation A1. |
| The project design has been generally evaluated as weak; it was not an adequate navigation tool for SGP's implementation. Future designs should make a greater effort in terms of characterizing intervention areas, increased understanding of the |

¹ Rare is a global leader in driving social change for people and nature. For over 45 years, across 60 countries, we have inspired and empowered millions of people and their communities to shift their behaviors and practices to protect our shared planet.

ecosystems, providing quantitative data to justify targets and interventions using gender equality perspective. Larger meaningful stakeholder consultation and effective participation during project design could bridge information gaps and improve appropriation.

Management response:

PARTIALLY REJECT

The project was designed based on experience from previous SGP operational phases which still relied on the global design of the GEF-SGP programme. It is important to note that the process was started at the country level involving multi-stakeholders representing various institutions and local needs, reviewed by regional and global levels, and endorsed by GEF Secretariat (and GEF Council). In this phase, the project was designed using a landscape/seascape approach for the first time.

After evaluating the results of GEF-SGP6 around the world, the SGP Country Programme and UNDP have decided to continue working on a similar approach in the GEF-SGP Seventh Operational Phase (GEF-SGP7) and make a greater effort in terms of characterizing intervention areas, increasing understanding of ecosystem, providing quantitative data to justify targets and interventions using a gender equality perspective and in ensuring greater stakeholder consultation and effective participation to bridge information gaps and improve appropriations.

| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
|--|--------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| | | | Comments | Status |
| UNDP to make greater efforts in characterizing intervention areas, increasing understanding of the ecosystems, providing quantitative data to justify targets and interventions using gender equality perspective and ensuring larger meaningful stakeholder consultation and effective participation as part of the design of the Seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP in Indonesia | January 2022 | UNDP CO, SGP Country Programme | | Completed |

Terminal Evaluation recommendation A2.

Failing and unsuccessful projects are perhaps more important to assess and analyze than the successful ones. Key aspects behind failure and success should be analyzed to improve project preparation and selection process.

Management response:

Partially accept

The SGP Country Programme did not only analyze only successful grant-funded projects but also unsuccessful ones. It summarized the results of analysis through interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and other relevant activities and compiled these findings in the Case Study entitled "Case Study: Experience of Implementation of the GEF SGP Indonesia – UNDP Phase-6 Project in Indonesia."

This process for accessing and analyzing unsuccessful and successful projects will continue when implementing the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP.

We disagree with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry being the responsible entity for this recommendation. In fact, the Responsible Party is the Implementing Partner/NGO, Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan (YBUL). For information and clarification, GEF-SGP has been a project under NGO Execution. It has never been under a National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Responsible Party has been an NGO (in this case is *Yayasan Bina Usaha*

| <i>Lingkungan</i>) that signed a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with the UNDP Country Office in Indonesia. The Project Document (ProDoc) has only been signed by UNDP Country Office in Indonesia. | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| 1. The project will analyze successes and failures from OP6 grants and compile them into a Case Study "Experience of Implementation of the GEF SGP Indonesia – UNDP Phase-6 Project in Indonesia." | November 2021 | SGP Country Programme | | Completed |
| 2. Lesson Learned from successful and unsuccessful SGP grants are fully integrated into the GEF-SGP OP-7 Project Design | January 2022 | UNDP | | Completed |
| B. Stakeholder Participation | | | | |
| Terminal Evaluation recommendation B1. Stakeholder's involvement plan should not only list potential actors and organizations. It should also describe them and analyze concrete measures and activities that will be carried out to ensure their involvement and participation from the benefits derived from project intervention. | | | | |
| Management response: Partially accept In the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP, the SGP Country Programme and UNDP strengthened the stakeholder engagement plan to include potential actors/ organizations, explained their roles, analyzed concrete actions and activities that will be undertaken to ensure their involvement and participation. For this specific project, we do not agree with the Ministry of the Environment and Forestry being listed as entity responsible for this recommendation. Indeed, the GEF-SGP has been a project under NGO Execution. It has never been under a National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Responsible Party has been an NGO (in this case is Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan) that has a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with UNDP Indonesia. The Project Document (ProDoc) has been signed by UNDP Indonesia only. | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Designing a stronger Stakeholder Engagement Plan that describe such stakeholders and analyze concrete measures and activities that will be carried out to ensure their full participation | January 2022 | UNDP | | Completed |
| Terminal Evaluation recommendation B2. | | | | |

| Communities and host organizations were not involved in project design. It is recommended to improve their participation, especially in setting goals and targets. | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Management response: | | | | |
| REJECT | | | | |
| <p>From project design to evaluation process, the SGP County Program always invited and involved the community as indicated by the fieldwork reports prepared during project design, monitoring reports, and internal evaluation reports. At that time, host organizations were not selected yet. Therefore, they were not considered involved in the project design by the evaluation. However, the SGP Country Program invited potential host organizations to engage in the stakeholder consultation process. In accordance with SGP Operational Guidelines, the host organizations were selected after (1) the project document (prodoc) was endorsed by GEF CEO; (2) UNDP Indonesia received Delegation of Authority to sign the prodoc for implementation; (3) National Steering Committee (NSC) was established, and (4) Small grant mechanism was established and endorsed by the NSC. During the project design (preparation), in accordance with GEF SGP Operational Guidelines, UNDP was not supposed to disburse any grant (funds) without proper mechanism.</p> <p>The SGP Country Programme and UNDP have decided to continue working on a similar approach in the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP and will involve communities and potential host organisation in project design, especially in setting goals and targets.</p> | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| The SGP Country Programme invited and involved the community on project design of the Seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP in Indonesia | January 2022 | UNDP CO, SGP Country Programme | | Completed |
| Terminal Evaluation recommendation B3. | | | | |
| The Ministry of the Environment and Forestry could have played a greater role in project implementation, especially in terms of dissemination of lessons learned and scaling up technologies and practices implemented by communities. | | | | |
| Management response: | | | | |
| Partially accept | | | | |
| <p>In future projects, the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP, the SGP Country Programme and UNDP will continue to collaborate with MoEF (or KLHK) through active involvement of GEF Indonesia secretariat office, GEF OFP as co-chair of the NSC of GEF SGP, social forestry activities, and the ICCA registry (part of the Directorate General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation program under MoEF). The SGP Country Programme and UNDP will encourage MoEF to get benefit from GEF SGP project and disseminate SGP's lesson learned at national and global level.</p> <p>We disagree with the statement of Ministry of the Environment and Forestry as the Responsible Party. It is to clarify that GEF-SGP has been a project under NGO Execution. It has never been under a National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Responsible Party has been an NGO (in this case is Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan) that has a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with UNDP Indonesia. The Project Document (ProDoc) has been signed by UNDP Indonesia only.</p> | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |

| Formulation of Knowledge Management Strategy and Communication Strategy for the 7 th operational phase of the GEF SGP in Indonesia. During such development of these strategies, consultations will be made with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry for more dissemination of lessons learned and scaling up. | March 2023 | SGP Country Programme and UNDP | Will be implemented in the future GEF-SGP | Not initiated |
|--|------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------|
| <p>Terminal Evaluation recommendation B4. The Ministry of Women Empowerment and Children Protection should be involved in the project design and implementation so that the project's outputs and outcomes and the data could be used by the MoWECP. At the same time, it would also sensitize the ministry of Environment to gender-based natural resources management/governance discourses. The same recommendations also apply to other relevant ministries or governmental agencies.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Management response:</p> <p>Partially accept</p> <p>During the formulation of the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP project document, only certain government and other relevant government agencies at local level (village, sub-district, district, and provincial) were invited for consultation. This practice was conducted in the preparation of Sixth operational phase of the GEF-SGP and it continues in the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP. The SGP Country Programme will involve the MoWECP during implementation of the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP.</p> <p>We disagree with the statement that responsible entity is Ministry of Women Empowerment and Children Protection. GEF SGP is a project using an NGO Execution mechanism (and not a NIM). It has been focusing on activities that have been implemented at the grass root level. The project is meant to create a balance of international support to ensure sustainable development at local levels involving grass roots with National Implementation Modality (NIM) projects.</p> | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Involving the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Children Protection when developing and implementing landscape/seascape strategies | 2022-2026 | SGP Country Programme | Will involve the MoWECP in the future GEF-SGP (GEF-SGP7) | Not initiated |
| <p>Terminal Evaluation recommendation C1. Report on project indicators should be disaggregated between direct and indirect impacts derived from project intervention. There should be a clear indication about what has been achieved through GEF investments and what has been accounted as progress funded by other sources.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Management response:</p> <p>Fully accept</p> <p>The SGP Country Programme together with UNDP will develop a monitoring system that is easy to use by the local communities and relevant stakeholders to disaggregate between direct and indirect impacts derived from project interventions.</p> | | | | |

| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
|--|---------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------|
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Develop a monitoring system that enable disaggregation of direct and indirect impacts derive from the project interventions | July 2022 | UNDP, SGP Country Programme | Will be conducted in the future GEF-SGP | Not initiated |
| <p>Terminal Evaluation recommendation C2. Implementation should allocate sufficient time and facilitate dedicated spaces for PMU and host organizations to ensure a common understanding of project strategy, goals and targets. These spaces to share views and lessons learned should continue during implementation.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Management response:</p> <p>Fully accept</p> <p>Since the implementation of the sixth operational phase of the GEF-SGP, the SGP Country Programme and host organizations have attended a series of workshops to ensure a common understanding of project strategy, goals and targets. In fact, the SGP Country Programme also opens a discussion session for each host organizations to conduct daily consultations. This space for sharing views and learning continues throughout implementation. It is even more often carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic by holding regular bi-monthly meetings among hosts and among implementing partners. The SGP Country Programme will continue to provide space to share views and lessons with grantees-partners and host organizations during the implementation of the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP.</p> <p>SGP Country Programme will develop better work strategy to host organization therefore they have enough time to ensure common understanding of project strategy, goals, and targets.</p> | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Continuous engagement with host organizations to ensure a common understanding of project strategy, goals and targets. | March 2023 | SGP Country Programme, UNDP | Will be conducted in the future GEF-SGP | Not initiated |
| <p>Terminal Evaluation recommendation C3. It is recommended that personnel or an organization is given a specific task to ensure the adoption of, or to link, the project outputs and outcomes in national level government.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Management response:</p> <p>FULLY ACCEPT</p> <p>Yes, SGP Country Programme will select an organization to conduct a specific task to ensure the adoption of, or to link, the project outputs and outcomes in national level government.</p> | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Exploring the feasibility for a personal or an organization facilitating the adoption of, or to link, the project outputs and | February 2024 | SGP Country Programme, UNDP | Will be implemented in the future GEF-SGP | not initiated |

| outcomes in national level government. | | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|----------|---------------|
| D. Gender | | | | |
| Terminal Evaluation recommendation D1. | | | | |
| Add gender-based qualitative indicators to ensure the long-term changes by increasing stakeholders' knowledge/awareness on inclusive, if not specifically mentioned as gender mainstreamed natural resources management so that it will strengthen the overall gender responsive/sensitive approach of the project. An activity to achieve this target could be in form of gender equality and social inclusion training for community members, men and women, grantees and government officials | | | | |
| Management response: | | | | |
| Partially accept | | | | |
| A gender analysis action plan has been developed and defined in the project design of the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP (on annex 9 of the ProDoc) that included gender-based qualitative indicators to ensure the long-term changes by increasing stakeholders' knowledge/awareness on inclusive, and an activity to achieve this target could be in form of gender equality and social inclusion training for the community members, men and women, grantees and government officials. | | | | |
| For this particular project, we disagree with the term of the Ministry of the Environment and Forestry and Ministry of Women Empowerment and Children Protection as the Responsible Parties. GEF SGP is a project using an NGO Execution mechanism (and not a NIM). It has been focusing on activities that have been implemented at the grass root level. The project is meant to create a balance of international support to ensure sustainable development at local levels involving grass roots with National Implementation Modality (NIM) projects. | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Develop a gender analysis and action plan, including gender-based qualitative indicators and gender-related trainings, when formulating the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP | January 2022 | UNDP | | Completed |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Refine the project results framework to add gender-based qualitative indicators; and followed by b. Refine the gender action plan as part of the inception workshop to include gender-based qualitative indicators and gender-related trainings | September 2022 | UNDP, SGP Country Programme | | Not initiated |
| Terminal Evaluation recommendation D2. | | | | |
| Define indicators that qualitatively measure the changes of women and other marginalized groups, leadership in community-based landscape/seascape management. In addition to the gender-based quantitative indicators. For example, setting indicator on women or other marginalized groups' increasing capacities to speak in public (e.g. women's group, community's meeting, speaking to the authorities, depending on the context), in advocating for their rights fulfilment in landscape/seascape management, or increasing positive perception of men and women in regards with women's roles in | | | | |

| landscape/seascape management. An example of activities to achieve this result could be exchange learning programme between community groups (women groups, youth groups, etc.) not only between the grantees | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------------------|---|---------------|
| Management response: | | | | |
| Partially accept | | | | |
| <p>During project design of the seventh operational phase of the GEF-SGP, a gender analysis action plan has been developed and defined (on annex 9 of the ProDoc). However, it is currently missing indicators that qualitatively measure the changes of women and other marginalized groups, leadership in community-based landscape/seascape management. It is proposed to include such indicators as part of the project inception workshop. Progress towards achievement of the gender mainstreaming targets will be monitored and evaluated on an annual basis, at a minimum. Results will be documented in project implementation review (PIR) reports and other progress reports. Gender mainstreaming results and lessons learned will be shared as part of the project's knowledge management strategy, and experiences on SGP project's will be input for project management.</p> <p>We disagree with the term of the Ministry of the Environment and Forestry as the Responsible Parties. The GEF SGP is a project using an NGO Execution mechanism (and not a NIM). It has been focusing on activities that have been implemented at the grass root level. The project is meant to create a balance of international support to ensure sustainable development at local levels involving grass roots with National Implementation Modality (NIM) projects.</p> | | | | |
| Key action(s) | Time frame | Responsible unit(s) | Tracking | |
| | | | Comments | Status |
| Revise the project results framework as part of the inception workshop to include indicators that qualitatively measure the changes of women and other marginalized groups, leadership in community-based landscape/seascape management. | September 2022 | SGP Country Programme and UNDP | Will be implemented in the future GEF-SGP | Not initiated |

2. Internal Audit Report:

Auditor's Recommendation:

We recommend that management have to consider in using accounting software for IP next project to facilitate their accounting process and to easily update according to Indonesian Accounting Standard. Our recommendation could be considered as a suggestion for development in IP's accounting process.

IP's Responses:

We will identify and select accounting software next month. We hope the accounting software will be installed and the training of the accounting staff will be conducted in three months.

3. Discussion on the closing event of the GEF SGP Indonesia program

The closing ceremony of the GEF SGP Indonesia OP6 program will be held on March 30-1 April 2022 online with the title "A Little Gift for Us". The event is a virtual photo exhibition and will show some video testimonials from the GEF SGP Indonesia OP6 partners. The event will be interactive. Each visitor can ask questions and comment. The event will be held live so that visitors can visit at any time during the three, scheduled days. Visitors are expected not only from Indonesia but also from GEF SGP partners in other countries. The event will be implemented by IMPRO, Weaving for Life Program, and Visual Literacy.

Comments and Discussions

1. Mr. Heru D Wardhana from PT. Martina Berto, Tbk received a management response prepared by the secretariat and UNDP in response to the recommendation from the terminal evaluator. He suggested that in the upcoming 7th phase, GEF SGP would cooperate with the Ministry of Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprises (Kemenkop UKM) and the Ministry of Women and Children Empowerment (KPPPA). He suggested that the GEF SGP secretariat find a way to link the activities in phase-7 with the activities carried out by the Kemenkop UKM and KPPPA.
2. Ms. Yanidar Witjaksono, director of YBUL received the management response prepared by the secretariat and UNDP in response to the recommendations from the evaluator terminal. She suggested that the GEF SGP secretariat cooperate with the Ministry of Finance. KEMENKEU has many funding programs for low-income communities and in villages. In addition, there is a funding program for MSMEs for Women. So that micro activities can be upscaled. Preferably in phase-7, baseline data is strengthened to measure project impact.
3. Mr. Agus Prabowo, Head of Environment Units of UNDP believes that the external evaluator team evaluates the contents of the Pro Doc, instead of evaluating the entire project. He said that the recommendation from the evaluator team should be accepted and used as input. He argued that the evaluator's findings do not provide serious indications. For phase-7, the GEF SGP secretariat needs to collaborate and link the project with other ministries such as KemendesPDTT, KPPPA and KemenkopUKM.
4. Mr. Prof. Dr. Ir. Purwanto DEA from LIPI approved the recommendations and management response that had been prepared. He also agreed to increase cooperation with the central government. For phase-7, it is necessary to pay attention to project achievements related to project quantitative and qualitative data for project sustainability.
5. Ms. Julia Kalmirah from WRI reminded again the basic principle of the SGP Programme which is not to provide large funds but funds are given to leverage community works so that the impact will be greater. However, this finding was not captured by the evaluators. So the moderately unlikely score for Financial Resources can't be justified.
6. Ms. Latipah Hendarti from the Detara Foundation said that the presentation of quantitative and qualitative data has been widely displayed and considered in GEF SGP OP6. This has been reported and presented by the community at a partner workshop, Musyawarah Bersama Mitra (MBM) in Bali. In addition, in GEF SGP OP-6, many new community groups such as PKK (The Indonesian Family Welfare Guidance Programme), Karang Taruna (community youth group), and women's groups have been strengthened. GEF SGP OP-6 has also developed a tool for evaluation, but it needs to be more developed in phase-7. Unfortunately, all of this was not captured by the evaluator team.
7. Ms. Noni Eka Rahayu from the Bureau of Foreign Cooperation of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry appreciated and congratulated on the completion of the GEF SGP OP-6 program. She deeply regrets that the evaluation team missed or did not capture the character of GEF SGP and its work. She approved the input from the evaluator team regarding sustainability and hopes that it can be applied in the next phase.
8. Mr. Anton Sri Probiyantono, Program Manager of the UNDP Environment Unit, added that the process carried out at GEF SGP OP-6 has not yet been captured by the consultants, especially the activities that occur in the field. For example, social agreements that have occurred in the community. He agreed to accept recommendations from consultants so that they can be used as lessons for the next phase. As a

note on the evaluation process, the international consultant did not carry out an evaluation directly at the site, while the national consultant only carried out an evaluation at one location.

9. Mr. Agus Prabowo, Head of UNDP Environment Units has informed Mr. Norimasa Shimomura (UNDP Resident Representative) to give an introduction at the closing ceremony of GEF SGP OP-6 and Mr. Norimasa has mentioned his availability.

Conclusions:

1. Approve the results of Terminal Evaluation, recommendations, and management response
2. Approve the results of the Internal Audit Control
3. Approve the closing event of GEF SGP Indonesia OP6 by holding a virtual photo exhibition. The activities are carried out by IMPRO, Visual Literacy, and Weaving for Life.

Minutes: Meinar Sapto Wulan

Verified and approved by:



Yanidar Witjaksono
Director of YBUL

List of attendances

| | Name | Organization/Institution | Title/Position in the Organization | Mobile No. | Email |
|----|----------------------------|--|---|----------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Noni Eko Rahayu | Biro KLN KLHK | Analisis Kerja Sama | 081382551142 | noni.erahayu2@gmail.com |
| 2 | Yani Witjaksono | Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan | NSC Member | 0821 2260 9614 | yani.witjaksono@gmail.com |
| 3 | Latipah Hendarti | Detara Foundation | Direktur/Panitia Pengarah GEF SGP 6 | 082167424150 | fdetara@yahoo.com |
| 4 | Laura Reviani Bestari | Setditjen PPI | Analisis Kerjasama Teknik/Sekretariat GEF OFP | 085959838373 | gefsecindonesia@gmail.com |
| 5 | Hery Budiarto | YBUL GEF SGP Indonesia | Program Assistant | 0818839572 | hery@sgp-indonesia.org |
| 6 | Elin Shinta | UNDP Indonesia | Project Associate | 08119108913 | elshintamalau@gmail.com |
| 7 | Mathias Ola | Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan | Finance Manager | 081259906308 | mathias_ola@yahoo.com |
| 8 | Prof. Dr. Ir. Purwanto DEA | Komite Nasional MAB-UNESCO Indonesia, BRIN | Executive Director | 08128360011 | purwanto.lipi@gmail.com |
| 9 | Anton Sri Probiyantono | UNDP | | 08119203435 | anton.probiyantono@undp.org |
| 10 | Agus Prabowo | UNDP | Head of Environment Unit | 0811883572 | prabowo2009@gmail.com |
| 11 | Heru D Wardhana | PT Martina Bertho | Manage for Sustainability | 087882920747 | Wardhana478@gmail.com |
| 12 | Briggita Dewanti | PT Martina Bertho | CSR/CorpComm | 0815098885 | bbdewabti@martina.co.id |
| 13 | Catharina Dwihastarini | YBUL GEF SGP Indonesia | National Coordinator | 081511034358 | dwhastarini@sgp-indonesia.org |
| 14 | Julia Kalmirah | WRI Indonesia | | 0818861255 | Julia.kalmirah@wri.org |
| 15 | Meinar Sapto Wulan | YBUL GEF SGP Indonesia | GEF SGP Indonesia | 08567341172 | meinar@sgp-indonesia.org |

Pictures

