



First Lessons Learned from Indonesia (Review of forest rehabilitation initiatives - lessons from the past)

Progress report

CIFOR and FORDA Team
(Ani A. Nawir, Murniati, Lukas Rumboko, Tini Gumartini and Chiharu Hiyama)

For comments please send to a.nawir@cgiar.org

Project Leader
Dr. Takeshi Toma

This document is a DRAFT that is currently under discussion within the partners of the study. We anticipate that the paper will be revised further based on discussion with those who have interests on this study. We decided to make this draft available in its present form in order to ensure that the information contained is readily accessible to individuals and organizations those have an interest on the issue. The contents in this document are for discussions among the partners and do not necessarily represent the official policy or position of CIFOR and the research partners.

Executive Summary

Since May 2002 and funded by the Government of Japan with the Project Leader, Dr. Takeshi Toma, CIFOR and national partners in China, Vietnam, Philippines, Indonesia, Peru and Brazil have been conducting a study to draw strategic lessons from past experiences and use them to plan and guide future efforts. The study aims to increase the chances of success of future rehabilitation projects by identifying the approaches that have contributed to longer-term sustainability under different scenarios with minimal negative impacts on different stakeholders. In Indonesia, CIFOR is working closely with the scientists from FORDA (Forestry Research and Development Agency, Ministry of Forestry).

Based on questionnaires, interviews and literature reviews, 150 projects were selected as a basis for an inventory to analyse the key characteristics and changes in rehabilitation trends in Indonesia. From this list of 150, ten projects were selected for review using the following criteria:

1. projects were located in the ten provinces with the largest area of degraded forest
2. successful and failed projects based on general perception
3. approaches used (top-down, transition from top down to participatory, and strong emphasis on the participatory approach)
4. project period
5. representative sampling of the project distribution
6. willingness and interest of the project coordinator/personnel to collaborate in this research.

The selection processes and preliminary finding were presented and discussed during the firstday of the two-day workshop organised by CIFOR and FORDA.

The case studies were:

- Community based forest rehabilitation project under PHBM (Managing the forest with the community), Perhutani – LATIN Project under Multi-stakeholders Program- DFID in Sukabumi (2000/2001-ongoing)
- Reforestation and Tropical Forest Management Project in South Kalimantan (FINNIDA Project - Phase II to VI) (1983-1996)
- Rehabilitation Project on ex-HPH areas of PT Dwi Marta in Riau (1996-1999)
- Rehabilitation Project funded under the Reforestation Funds (DAK-DR) in Kampar District, Riau Province (2001/2002-ongoing)
- Rehabilitation projects (farm forestry) in Gunung Kidul, Yogyakarta Province (1970-ongoing)
- Upstream Solo Watershed Protection Project (1988-1996)
- Rehabilitation of Fire Affected Forests in East Kalimantan (1988-1996)
- Rehabilitation Project funded under the Reforestation Funds (DAK-DR) in Kutai Barat District, East Kalimantan Province (2001/2002-ongoing)
- Participatory Reforestation managed under the NGO YPSBK (Yayasan Perhutanan Sosial Bumi Khatulistiwa) (2002-presents)
- Conserving Meru Betiri National Park in Jember District (1992-ongoing)

Since the 1950s, rehabilitation projects have been implemented in about 400 locations. Areas ranged from two ha only to nine million ha. There is little clear evidence that rehabilitation initiatives and projects have successfully restored the degraded forests areas, while the policies and programmes to address the underlying causes of forest degradation have not been very effective.

Projects were mostly funded by the government of Indonesia (45 percent) and international donor agencies (23 percent). In terms of project aspects or activities, 81 percent of the projects focussed mainly on technical aspects and emphasised planting, 10 percent of the projects focussed on integrated socio-economic and technical aspects, 2 percent focussed on integrated natural resource management, and the remaining 7 percent focussed on socio-economic aspects, such as generating income for local people.

The Ministry of Forestry estimates that the current rehabilitation cost is in the range of USD 294 to 588. This review found that the cost per hectare ranged from USD 43 to USD 15,221, which reflects the high costs of past rehabilitation project implementation. Further showed that the projects funded by donor agencies were implemented with higher cost per ha compared to government funded-projects.

Three methods were used to evaluate the projects: based on the perception of concerned stakeholders, indicators of outputs and processes and taking into account the period after the project ended. Both outputs and processes were used as indicators, because judging success or failure is affected by the indicator used.

Based on outputs, most of the technical problems in unsuccessful projects were related to species matching, based on marketability and access to suitable markets. Other important considerations were capacity building and locally specific policy, regulations and programs that supported the project.

The rehabilitation project initiated in Wonosobo could be considered a success based on technical output indicators. This project is now considered as a successful Farm Forestry Model. Other successes were rehabilitation initiatives in Gunung Kidul, Yogyakarta, and in Bukit Soeharto (East Kalimantan). In general, projects that were sub-contracted had low rates of success.

Based on indicators, a common problem was the lack of participation in the planning process. Rehabilitation projects often failed to consider the livelihood aspect and were not based on the principle to generate benefits for local (surrounding) community. Bureaucratic mechanisms delayed the releasing of budgets and so delayed planting. Budgets were not always adequate. Other problems were unclear rights and responsibility, no clear land status, and lack of consideration of local cultures and customs.

Technical monitoring and evaluation has focussed on the percentage of tree survival. In general, there has been no specific evaluation of socio-cultural indicators and no involvement of the local community in the process. Based on the indicator process, the Inpres Project, and the project in Meru Betiri National Park can be considered successful. Based on socio-cultural indicators, the SFDP-GTZ Project in Sanggau was a success. The farm forestry project in Gunung Kidul and the project managed jointly by an NGO, community groups and the manager of the national park in Meru Betiri, West Java were considered as good examples of successful projects based on institutional indicators.

Another aspect to be considered is how long after the project has ended should it be evaluated. The Inpres project in Java was used as an example. As soon as the project ended it was evaluated as a failure. However, after 20-30 years, general perceptions now evaluate the project as a successful model for rehabilitation projects.