

Debriefing Report - Field Findings of Gunung Leuser and Way Kambas National Park (3rd – 16th March 2020) and Recommendations for SGP Packages

1. Mission Background and Methodology

The Mission to Indonesia took place from 3 - 16 March 2020 in cooperation with KKH of MoEF and the support of national expert Mr. Nurdin Razak. According to the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the International Community-based Livelihood Support and Development Specialist, the mission to Indonesia focused on the two selected AHPs, i.e. Gunung Leuser NP (GLNP) and Way Kambas NP (WKNP) and their adjacent areas.

The Collaborative Management Plan (CMP) of both AHPs was developed in cooperation between KKH and ACB to provide an effective backdrop for SGP grant interventions. In order to support a Call for Proposals (CfP) emphasizing SGP livelihood interventions, the consultant's tasks were revisiting the CMPs and identifying areas of support for Penabulu Foundation, the Service Provider (SP) to launch a CfP.

The CMP guides small grants investments towards priorities for conservation and livelihood investment which are identified under four thematic fields i.e. (a) General park management, (b) Law enforcement, (c) Habitat and species management, and (d) Community development and Ecotourism. Other cross cutting thematic areas include wildlife research and monitoring, community outreach and conservation awareness, and sector policy development.

The mission aims to: (i) prioritize and translate the management plans' intentions in supporting/developing livelihoods through identification and delineation of possible grant-packages in support of that potential, (ii) refining the underlying selection criteria as well as (iii) supporting the Service Provider (i.e. Penabulu Foundation) in finalizing the design of the grant packages. The assigned task also included re-visiting the social-ecological setting with focus on its potential for livelihoods developments, validating and updating information and issues that were identified in the CMPs through field observation and interviews. Analysis was made to assess the selected interventions as described in the CMPs based on the information obtained from CMPs, the Project Management Manual (PMM) and field findings. A set of prioritized interventions for each AHP was selected and were integrated in the proposed SGP packages for the consideration of NWT and KKH.

Impediments

In response to the COVID 19 pandemic, the Government of Indonesia imposed as of mid-March restriction to travel and individual free movements. Limitations extended to gathering and meetings that affected the planned work and field visit to WKNP. Only brief visit to Braja Harjasari village could be conducted, while the agreed meetings with WKNP's administration park and other communities could not be conducted. Hence the data collected for WKNP is not sufficient for detailed analysis. Analysis made for WKNP will be mainly based on the CMP of WKNP.

On the other hand, the field visit to GLNP could be conducted more or less according to plan.

Methodology

Methods employed for the mission were the Semi-Structured Interviews (SSI) with Key Informants (KI), Focus-group Discussions (FGD) with community members and National Park rangers, and Participatory Monitoring and Assessment (PMA) with key actors addressing the livelihood development issue in the targeted areas. The Project Management Manual (PMM) and approved CMP for each AHP provide the principal references and were used throughout the assignment.

In order to obtain diversified information and at the same time avoiding biased opinions, the consultant cross-checked these facts and opinions through further SSI, FGD and meetings with cooperation partners. The SSI was also used to collect and discuss individual opinions on issues that are more sensitive. PMA was

used to engage key actors, e.g. senior tourist guides, village leaders, and inquired their opinions and concerns on discussed issues. The PMA was applied extensively in field visits to Tangkahan Resort.

The results obtained with the described methods above, led to the analysis of the current situation in comparison to the information on which the CMPs were based. The analytical focus remained on the development of livelihood in the adjacent areas of the AHP. This step resulted to the identification of priority questions for SGP interventions and to the review of the selection criteria based on the selected intervention that will be included in the SGP packages.

The report followed the above logic and was structured according to the Scope of Work (Mission ToR) as listed below:

- Background of mission and methodology
- Review and update of current situation of the targeted AHP and its adjacent communities including assessment of training needs
- Analysis of findings (field visits, CMP and PMM) and identification of priority interventions for each targeted community
- SGP packages recommendations
- Other recommendations
- Conclusions

2. Review and Update Information of Existing / On-going / Planned Livelihood Interventions

This section includes and addresses the field findings and observations which are additional to the findings in the CMP. Such findings include challenges faced by the affected stakeholders and opportunities that were observed. The findings will be described for each NP and its adjacent communities.

2.1 Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP), Region III and the adjacent communities

SGP's agreed intervention area of GLNP Region III and its buffer zone is located predominately in Langkat District. According to the CMP, Batu Katak, Bukit Lawang, Batu Rongring, Tangkahan, Bukit Mas, Sekoci and Bekancan are selected as project implementation sites. Following GLNP Resort Based Management (RBM) as the main management strategy, site selections are referring and classifying based on location of the related resorts. The relevant resorts are Bahorok, Bukit Lawang, Tangkahan, Cinta Raja, Sekoci and Bekancan.

The mission's visit to Gunung Leuser NP covered the NP administrative center in Medan, the NP office for Region III in Stabat, Besitang - Pir ADB Village and Pantai Buaya Village (located in Sekoci Resort in the North of the NP), Tangkahan Resort and Bukit Lawang Resort (in the Western buffer-zone of NP) as recommended by KKH and Park Administration. These areas constitute the focus areas for SGP conservation and livelihood grant interventions. Bukit Lawang and Tangkahan are popular tourist destinations for domestic and international visitors, meanwhile Sekoci Resort (the related NP Resort) faces serious encroachment. Due to the ecological diversity, level of village development, needs of communities and conservation focus, emphasis may be given more to conservation activities as the main intervention with livelihood intervention as supporting activities and vice-versa.

Throughout the mission, a close and intensive cooperation between key stakeholders, e.g. between villages, park management, and local NGOs was observed. CMPs are considered as a joint output and a common understanding for the necessary interventions which are to be incorporated into the conservation efforts of the NP.

The encroachment by oil-palm plantations into the NP, human-wildlife conflicts (e.g. wild-life intrusions to the farms), difficulties of farmers to obtain direct market access, free-wheeling development of mass tourism, illegal logging and unsustainable natural resources harvest, comparatively low standards of tourism services, facilities and infrastructure, are identified as the perpetual major challenges for

stakeholders in general and the park management in particular. These challenges are reflected in the CMP as well as observed during field observations. The mission explicitly validated the above viewpoint.

2.1.1 Sekoci Resort

Sekoci Resort covers an area of about 25,000 ha. The mission's field visit covered two villages i.e. Besitang – Pir ADB and Pantai Buaya.

General field findings in addition to CMP are the following:

- The agricultural areas in the north and east of the NP which the consultant have visited, are dominated by large palm-oil plantations, which enclose the whole of Pir ADB Village and other buffer zones of the NP. There is a threat of further encroachment caused by the expansion of plantation.
- The NP also faced encroachment of local farms for several years before the dispute between local farmers and NP Administration had been settled in 2007. As an integral part of the dispute settlement, the damaged area of 2,000 ha was declared for the restoration area.
- Another important part of the dispute settlement was the village groups are partially permitted to access the restoration zone for use and restoration work. The NP administration supported villages in Sekoci in establishing village user groups to access the restoration zone. This combination has resulted in trust building and facilitated close cooperation of the NP administration and villages. These village user groups have long term contracts with the NP administration, and are tasked to restore, conserve, and protect against illegal use of the assigned areas. This approach has created an inner buffer-zone, which has proven to be effective against both of the encroachment and the illegal use of natural resources of the National Park.
- There is also the threat of infrastructure development into the NP, e.g. the opening of forest roads and the clearing of forests. This development causes landslides and flooding. Eased access to forest encourages illegal forms of forest utilization including encroachment.

Besitang-Pir ADB Village

- In Besitang –Pir ADB village, all farmers have sold their farm-land to palm-oil company. About 50% of working population has permanent jobs at the nearby palm-oil company. This village is now located inside oil palm plantation and only has small home gardens.
- Landless families (likely former farmers) living in Besitang-Piradb Village have started to encroach the NP through the establishment of illegal plantations (i.e. rubber, fruit orchards such as durian, lemon, orange, mango etc.) and farms for the production of cash crops and vegetables. The productivity of the farms is low and the produce (fruits and vegetables) are sold below market price to whole-sale buyers due to lack of transportation and direct access to market place
- At the day of mission visited, 12 village groups have been established with the support of NP administration and given the access to the previous encroached land.

Pantai Buaya Village

- In Pantai Buaya village, Orangutan Information Centre (OIC), a local NGO has been supporting local communities in restoring the damaged forest areas. OIC had also provided additional advice and assistance in livelihood development and financial support for environmental education and eco-friendly farming as well as establishing Eco-School.
- The newly-established Eco-School in Pantai Buaya is a formal school, which follows government curriculum and enriched with 30% ecology lessons. The school runs a farm with an approximate area of 100 ha where modern perma-agriculture and agroforestry technologies are demonstrated. The Eco-School plays an important role in raising awareness for environmental issues, biodiversity conservation and locally produced bio-products.
- In addition, OIC with the village have successfully carried out cultivation-test of vanilla, established processing facilities for extracting essential oil from lemongrass, and for processing facility for soap production. The village has a contract with international company "Lush-Cosmetics" from UK, that is act as the buyer for their essential oil. The farm is planning to extend its capacity into a venture for production of orange and lemon juice.

- Despite the success in the farm and its processing activities, Eco-School still seeks for fund to support their on-going and planned activities. The farmland is also under annual pressure from wild pigs encroachment, which cause significant damage related to human-wildlife conflict. Although some fences were erected to address the wild pigs encroachment, the persistent lack of finances hampers the maintenance works as well as the extension of fencing around the farms to prevent further damages.

2.1.2 Tangkahan Resort

Tangkahan Resort covers an area of 15,000 ha with 8 sub-villages, of which 6 are located outside of the buffer zone and the other 2 are adjacent to the NP border. According to the village representative, about 700 families live in Tangkahan resort. Tangkahan is a popular tourist destination according to the CMP. The sub-villages are surrounded by secondary forest and oil palm plantation. There are 9 elephants and their mahouts, which assist the park authorities in mitigation human-elephant conflict and in patrolling. These elephants are also function as the main tourist attraction. The forest and the Buluh River and Batang River) provide a wide range of opportunities for visitors and for research.

General field findings in addition to CMP are the following:

- Among of the villagers practice on selective logging at limited scale, the secondary forest was observed to have good growth and not much disturbed. There are many large climax-trees in these sites which allow re-growth and support to the natural regeneration of the primary forest. This is an opportunity of recovering of primary forest in near future, if the ecology of this area remains by-and-largely undisturbed.
- Traditionally, the people in Tangkahan used rainforest for hunting, collection of medicinal plants and logging. Beginning of 2003, negotiations between villages and NP administration resulted in the halted of logging. For financial support, the community-based tourism (CBT) was established. Unfortunately, there occurrence of illegal collection of non-timber forest products, rattan and illegal fishing still persist.
- Since the introduction of CBT and as of today, there are 60 tourist guides and 20 guest-houses and homestays in operation. About 250 families out of 700 families have benefited from the community-based tourism. According to guest-house owners and village guides, the capacity in operating the CBT at current levels is adequate. However, there is a need to improve the quality of services as well as the facilities and infrastructure for this sector in order to address the more diversified group of visitors. .
- There is also a lack of personnel capacity in technical maintenance of guest-houses, modern waste-management systems (e.g. recycling / reuse), marketing and financing.
- Besides tourism, agriculture remains an important livelihood source of income. However, the farmers face challenges of wildlife encroachment (in particular elephants) into their farms and loss their livestock to tigers. The measured damages per annum are about 1 million IDR. In order to stabilise farming, also as a partner for local tourism businesses, the human-wildlife conflict needs to be addressed.

2.1.3 Bukit Lawang Resort

Bukit Lawang Resort covers an area of approximately 12,400 ha. CMP-GLNP describes the resort as famous for orangutan watching and a destination for international and domestic visitors, with 200 visitors per day at high season to 20-30 visitors per day at low season. In addition, forest trekking, tubing, swimming, caving and culinary are the common tourism activities. Perkampungan Bukit Lawang, Timbang Java and Sampe Raya are the villages located in the buffer zone. The majority of population is engaged in tourism and tourism sector related activities; about 26% of the population works in this local business sector.

General field findings in addition to CMP are the following:

- There is presence of several professional NGOs (e.g. Orangutan Information Centre - OIC, Yayasan Ekosistem Lestari -YEL) support biodiversity conservation, environmental education and community development in the Resort. Both NGOs operate within the villages located in the buffer-zone of GLNP. In line with YEL focuses works on conservation and environmental education, the NGO also runs an eco-farm and the Eco-Lodge in Bukit Lawang.

- The NP management observes the increasing tourism and arrival numbers with caution. There are already signs of emerging threats to the NP integrity caused by uncontrolled tourism development, e.g. the concentration of hotels, restaurants and souvenir-shops in certain areas, damages and disturbance to nature and communities caused by high numbers of seasonal visitors which is up to 200 visitors per day. Such threat need to be taken seriously and measures should be taken to reduce the threat. Future interventions should consider to look into the integrating the conservation works of NP as part of livelihood development to ensure sustainable development of the NP.
- The increasing numbers of visitors lead some tourist-guides to feed orangutans in the wild to guarantee the wishes of tourists. This behaviour has already led to the reported attacks by the apes. This practice has a direct negative bearing to both efforts of conservation and orangutan rehabilitation/surviving rate in the wild by the NP's conservation and Orang Utan Rehabilitation Centre. An agreed code of conduct regulations between NP Management and the Guide Associations are currently absent.
- The termination of WWF financing caused the well-used tourist information centre was closed. The building is deteriorated and needs an immediate repair. There is also a need for updating the information on the boards and all documentaries which are out-dated.

2.2. Way Kambas National Park (WKNP) and its adjacent communities

Due to the Gol's measures to curb COVID 19 spread, the mission meetings with the NP management in Way Kambas; i.e. the scheduled field visits to several villages and WKNP Administration were cancelled. The Consultant was only able to conduct a brief visit to Braja Harjosari. Therefore the field findings may not reflect the exact situation of Braja Harjosari. Analysis made is based on the field findings and the data obtain from CMP. The pilot villages Rantau Jaya Udik II and Braja Harjosari were the focus areas of WKNP in this mission.

Based on the CMP, WKNP is known for its tourism activities related to elephant conservation. The vision of WKNP is to create an ideal habitat for the Sumatra protected wild species that brings self-sufficiency and prosperity to local communities.

The CMP recorded that recurring forest fires, poaching, elephant-human conflict/wildlife encroachment, illegal resources harvesting such as grass and firewood and illegal grazing are main challenges that WKNP faces. In addition, the welfare of elephants in the NP is also a rising issue. Besides, the programmes and activities related to the management of the WKNP have not been systematically integrated into the framework of village development and vice-versa. At present, the programmes that run at the village level are managed by other governmental agency while the WKNP and related offices are more directed to provide technical assistance. The legality of activities at the village level (MoU/PKS with the village government) is still considered unclear and only limited collaborations of WKNP administration and village communities were observed.

2.2.1. Braja Harjosari village

According to WKNP's CMP, Braja Harjaosari is located in Braja Selehah Sub-district, East Lampung and covers an area of 1,075 hectares. It has 8 sub-villages, in total 1700 families with about 5800 population as of in 2016. One sub-village is a Balinese village. Under the WKNP Buffer Zone Community Empowerment Plan 2016-2025, the District government had designated Braja Harjosari as one of the tourism villages and food self-sustaining villages in 2016. The aim is to improve the welfare and livelihood of the village community. Braja Harjosari has enormous potential for tourism, though is still untapped. Both, domestic and international tourists are interested to visit the village due to its diverse features and close location to the adjacent WKNP. Potentially, Braja Harjosari could offer tourism activities such as 1) horse riding at the savanna (a large, rather flat dry-land area); 2) boat trip down to the Way Penet River; 3) enjoying Balinese culture and arts; 4) Visit Crystal Guava and Dragon Fruit Agroparks; and 5) Circuit Motor Trail. These diverse features could be further developed by the community into village thematic tour.

At present, Braja Harjosari has 12 home stays in two sub-villages (one of them is the Balinese village) to support village tourism development. Simultaneously, the potential of Braja Harjosari to be recognized as a

conservation village model is very high due to its existing conservation activities developed by the community groups. However, there is not much synergy observed between WKNP administration and Village government in developing the conservation works in WKNP. Under the village development plan, Braja Harjosari is also categorized as high Village Development Index (IPD) (hierarchy I) which is one of the economic-growth centres for the surrounding villages. Due to its adjacent location to the NP, dynamic and potential for development, it is evident to steer Braja Harjosari development in such not only improving the livelihood development but integrate them to support the conservation of WKNP.

General field findings in addition to CMP are the following:

- Despite Braja Harjosari's potential as tourist destination/ development for tourism, there is no advertisement, bill-boards or any information for tourists.
- The community offers 12 home-stays for visitors. It means, there are only several families of the community benefited from this sector. The home-stays are located in two sub-villages, and one of home-stay located at Balinese village. The Braja Harjosari village is an early transmigration settlement, therefore the home-stays offer various culture and cuisine from Sumatra, Java and Bali. Families that offer homestay for tourists received support for the renovation/upgrading of their houses to provide tourist accommodation. The villagers received no education or training in dealing with tourists or hospitality service like the basics of host-tourist relationships.
- According to a NP guide who also operates homestay, tourist complained that it is expensive to spend a day in WKNP compare to other NPs. Additional "ranger fee" up to 45 EUR (750,000 IDR Rp) per day-trip is charged to tourists.
- A majority of population in the village are farmers. They grow maize, cassava, water-melon and rice as cash-crops and raise livestock e.g. cattle and chickens as part of their farming activities. The community members also run household business producing cassava crackers.
- About 50% of the farmers have loan/credit, which they have to pay back after harvest. There is one whole-sale buyer that controls the purchase of products, provision of seeds and agro-chemicals and provides loan. The whole-sale buyer pays farmers about 30% less than the recommended payment price from Government of Indonesia.
- From the interviews, it noted that farmers are interested to diversify and improve their income through honey bee-farming and production as well as through direct access to the market.

3. Analysis and Identification of Priority Interventions to be Supported by the SGP

The following analysis is presented in a table/matrix; the results of the field visits and the information and guidelines contained in CMP and PMM forming the basis for the analysis. The analysis is carried out against and according to the existing list of interventions in the CMP's of GLNP and WKNP.

The following criteria are the basis of analysis for the prioritization of interventions listed in the CMP:

- i. contribution to biodiversity conservation ,
- ii. improving the living conditions of people
- iii. capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution,
- iv. gender and job creation for young people,
- v. contribution to resiliency of communities towards climate change,
- vi. cost efficiency,
- vii. achievable results in the short and medium term.

For further distinction, a scaled evaluation system (1-5) is introduced to prioritize the interventions, in which the numbers 1 = the lowest priority, 2 = less priority, 3 = moderate priority, 4 = high priority and 5 express the highest priority. "Category 5 Highest Priority" in this system stands for the express recommendation to be included in the proposed intervention, followed by "Category 4- High priority" in the next planned call for grant proposals. Annex 1 shows the listed interventions and their scoring scale.

Intervention which scores more than 30 has the highest priority, 25 – 30 is high priority, 16 - 24 is moderate priority, 10 -15 is less priority and score which is below 10 is considered lowest priority.

The matrix below includes the suggested activities for the interventions as part of criteria for grant consideration.

3.1 GLNP

As stipulated in CMP, a total of eight interventions were listed as key activities of community development for livelihood. These exclude eco-tourism sub-programme which is also a part of livelihood intervention. The following table shows the matrix of analysis for the mentioned community development interventions and ecotourism / ecological friendly tourism based on the findings for targeted areas i.e. Sekoci Resort, Tangkahan Resort and Bukit Lawang Resort. The proposed priority interventions can be used as a guideline for the other two Resorts (Bekacan and Bahorok) which were not included in the field visits due to limited time.

| Intervention | Priority | Remarks/ Justification | Suggested Activities |
|---|----------|---|---|
| 1. Development of Community-based organisation on livelihoods | 2 | There are presence of village groups/organisations in the targeted areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support to getting appropriate legal status, if e.g. required for community forestry. - Engagement of communities in NP conservation work and village development planning |
| 2. Training and coaching on institutional strengthening | 3 | There are needs of the village groups and NP administration for better and effective organization to enhance the conservation efforts in GLNP. This intervention is a cross cutting activity for selected interventions for investment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of institution capacity and needs. - Trainings on organisation, participatory planning of activities, book keeping, financing. - Training of leadership in conservation & sustainable management of park. - Trainings of trainers. |
| 3. Community forestry/ agroforestry enhancement by undertaking community based-NFTP development | 5 | The intervention is of highest priority for Sekoci and Tangkahan Resorts. Both resorts exhibit capacity and readiness in further developing NTFP which will contribute to diversifying their livelihood incomes as well as making them to be more resilience to climate change impacts. In Sekoci, there is already close collaboration with NP administration in accessing the park. However, sustainable collection or harvest of NTFP (medicinal plants, fish, wild honey etc.) should be monitored. Establishment of community forestry in Tangkahan will promote trust building between NP administration and villages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legalization/ registration of community forests including the agreement between NP management and villages. - Delineation of community forestry areas and pre-dominant land-use type. - Establishment of pilot community forests in Tangkahan, Bukit Lawang, Bekacan if requires. - Feasibility study of identified NTFP and the possible establishment of benefit sharing e.g. Payment for Ecosystem (PES). - Assess the impact of collection of medicinal plants, wild honey, rattan, fishing and hunting activities towards the conservation and socio economy of communities. - Establish guidelines for community |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | <p>at the same time reducing illegal poaching and fishing, collection of NTFP.</p> <p>There are NGOs who have already engaged in the sector. The intervention will create more job opportunities for the youth and outputs could be achieved in 1-3 years.</p> | <p>monitoring on the NTFP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trainings on sustainable collection of medicinal plants/wild honey/fishing. - Introducing certification of NTFP (if needed). This could be facilitated by CIFOR Indonesia/FSC international. - Conduct value chain analysis and establish direct market access to potential buyers. |
| 4. Community-based sustainable agriculture and livestock raising | 5 | <p>One way to increase livelihood income is to diversify the agriculture production. Majority of population of Sekoci and Tangkahan Resorts are farmers, who needs further support in improving soil fertility, crop productivity and diversification, and direct access to market.</p> <p>The Eco-School model in Pantai Buaya is one of the good examples that deserve up-scaling to other parts of the NP.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstration plots for smart / sustainable agriculture. - Feasibility study of potential agriculture produce (both crops and livestock) that are suitable to be cultivated or raised. The study should include the potential for local and regional market and its value chain. - Assessment of farmers' needs (techniques/ equipment) and capacity for the identified agriculture activities. - Training of the use of modern / local adaptable technology for harvesting, storage and compost making. - Training of the use of fencing, plants/ trees for reduction of wildlife encroachment. |
| 5. Community-based tree planting and natural feeds plants for wildlife in designated agreed locations | 4 | <p>The intervention could overcome/reduce human-wildlife conflict especially in Sekoci and Tangkahan Resorts. IPB students have conducted some studies related to human-wildlife conflict. It will also create new-side job opportunities for the villagers that could increase their household incomes.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification and delineation of suitable plots (PLUP). - Clarification of user-rights and obligations. - Assess which types of trees/ crops for suitable for enrichment of wildlife feed. - Assess the impact of the introduction. Study by IPB students could be used for further reference. - Establishment of nursery for seedlings. - Training of selected tree / crops planting. - Training of seedlings production. |
| 6. Training on local products making, create more diversify processing & post-production | 4 | <p>Eco-school of Sekoci Resort has demonstrated success in introducing vanilla cultivation and processing essential oil from lemon grass. This could be further upscale and introduce to other nearby villages.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify local products / handicrafts that have unique selling points. - Training needs assessment. - Feasibility study for value chain, quality considerations / control, and cost effectiveness of |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | There are existing local businesses in Bukit Lawang. A further development in post house-hold production will improve the incomes especially for the women communities. | introduction of processing and post production. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperative organisation training. - Upscaling the existing local products industry with emphasis on quality control. - Green business management training. |
| 7. Establishment of networking on local products makers to market | 4 | The farmers in Sekoci have no direct access to market their produce. They often have to sell their product at lower price (below ceiling price). The intervention focuses on farmers who have own land and not involved in illegal activities in NP. It is also relevant for linking NTFP collectors to potential buyers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify potential buyers, potential district/regional market. - Evaluate the potentials for coop-type marketing. - Facilitate the negotiation between farmers/NTFP collectors and buyers. - Equip farmers' knowledge on quality management and control, marketing skill and the quality of production including packaging. - Training of farmers in market price negotiation. |
| 8. Establishment of farmers and other relevant stakeholders to tourism industry | 5 | Both Bukit Lawang and Tangkahan Resorts are popular tourist destinations. This intervention will not only create other job opportunities in particular for women and youth communities, but also increase the house-hold incomes. However, there are institutional conflicts which need to be resolved. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support to establishing a GLNP certified tour and park guide. - Seek cooperation with tourism training facilities. - Identify interested farmers to supply their production to restaurant, homestays, guest-houses. - Assess service requirements v/s potential guest groups. - Assess the cuisine offered in the restaurants, homestays, guest-houses. - Training of planting crops/vegetables or raising livestock for production. - Training of standard production. - Facilitation of networking between farmers – tourism stakeholders. |
| 9. Ecotourism | 4 | This intervention is limited to Bukit Lawang, Tangkahan and Bahorok Resorts which already have established tourism facilities at village level. Priority to be given to tourism activities that contribute to conservation work and improve livelihood. The intervention needs clear definition of the “ecotourism”, “eco-friendly tourism”, community based tourism prior to implementation. Further inputs on analysing the current | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review and assess the existing tourism activities and its impacts to conservation work of GLNP. - Identify the gaps in operating ecological friendly tourism e.g. facilities/infrastructure. - Identify which entry points for each targeted area for implementation of eco-friendly tourism; this includes assessing the capacity in introducing eco-tourism certification. - Awareness strengthening and knowledge building for guide |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>status of targeted areas by ecological friendly tourism specialist for drafting concrete guidelines are critical to ensure selected interventions do not jeopardise the conservation work in GLNP.</p> <p>There should be synergies among governmental agencies such as forestry department, cultural and tourism, village/rural development to ensure the development of this sector contributes to protection and conservation of the AHP.</p> | <p>associations/community tour guides on ecological friendly tourism, conservation of NP and endangered species; i.e. orangutan, elephant, tigers etc.; traditional knowledge on wild / medicinal plants; history and local culture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening the NP management in administering and monitoring visitors, tourism activities, operation of tour guides. - Support to establishment of GLNP certified tour and park guide. - Seek cooperation with national tourism training facilities. - Strengthening the existing community based tourism through training on ecological friendly tourism. - Rebranding/marketing of tourism activities (secondary activities). - Private sector partnership (secondary activities). |
|--|--|---|---|

3.2 Way Kambas National Park (WKNP)

As stipulated in WKNP's CMP, programme of community livelihood improvement is sub-divided into five sub-programmes; i.e. (i) Community outreach and conservation awareness, (ii) community development focuses on agriculture and forestry commodities, (iii) development of priority village model, (iv) development of integrated eco-tourism model, and (v) strengthening stakeholder collaboration in the area of WKNP. For this assignment, the analysis included all key activities illustrated in sub programme (ii) and partial activities of sub programme (iii) & (iv) which are relevant to livelihood development. A total of nine (including eco-tourism) interventions are listed. The following table shows the matrix of analysis for the mentioned interventions based on the field findings on targeted areas; i.e. Braja Harjosari and Rantau Jaya Udik II and data based on the CMP.

| Intervention | Priority | Remarks/ Justification | Suggested Activities |
|---|----------|--|---|
| 1. Facilitating on community involvement in organic farming activities. | 4 | <p>The intervention is very relevant to Rantau Jaya Udik II which is categorized as supporting villages (IPD-hierarchy III) as well as Braja Harjosari in which agriculture is the main source of income. Organic farming can be cost effective for farmers with low external inputs and utilization of natural resources i.e. natural predators, herbal plants to control diseases. Thus reducing the cost of farming. Improvement of modern organic farming techniques</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstration plots for organic farming. Using the demonstration plots to sensitize communities on organic/natural farming and identify the interested farmers. - Feasibility study of potential agriculture produce (both crops, fruit trees and livestock) that are suitable to be cultivate and their market value, including assessment of farmers' needs and capacity. - Training of interested farmers on the organic farming techniques including use of natural predators to control diseases, making of composting to increase soil fertility. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | and soil fertility will enhance the productivity for the farmers. Sustainable productivity of organic farms can also supply its product to the existing guesthouses and homestays. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training of seeds collection. - Training of local adaptable technology for harvesting and storage. - Training of the use of fencing, plants/ trees for reduction of wildlife encroachment. - Upscaling of organic farming in Braja Harjasari. - Facilitating market linkage (local and Sumatra region). |
| 2. Improvement of institutional capacity of business groups | 3 | The intervention is relevant for both Braja Harjosari and Rantau Jaya Udik II Villages. This will reduce debt and improve business organisation especially when operating tourism and tourism related businesses. The strengthening of capacity will also contribute to gender equity when the engagement of women is anticipated to be increased. The intervention should be integrate as part of cross cutting activities for selected interventions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of capacity and needs. - Assessment of existing women business groups. - Trainings on business organisation, planning of activities, book keeping, marketing, business negotiation and finance management. - Training of leadership in conservation & green business management. |
| 3. Legal access of cooperation (MoU) and empowerment of business units group on NTFP developers such as Agrarwood nursery, orchids and honey | 4 | Legal access of NP to resources will facilitate trust building between NP administration and villages, as well as direct active engagement of villages to monitor and conserve their NP. The empowerment of innovative ideas in developing NTFP businesses will create more job opportunities for youth and women and for those landless farmers. This will reduce the pressure of human-activities that encroach the NP. Besides, there are NGOs who have already engaged in the sector. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delineation of community forestry areas and pre-dominant land-use type - Legally correct establishment and registration of community forestry including an agreement on rights and obligations. - Establishing community forestry and partnership with NP administration. - Feasibility study of identified NTFP businesses and the possible establishment of benefit sharing e.g. PES. - Establish guidelines for community monitoring on the NTFP. - Establish direct market access to potential buyers. - Training on green business management and marketing. |
| 4. Mentoring and optimizing Village Business units (BMUD) as village economic institutions | 2 | Despite the need for strengthening the Village Business Units, the intervention could be supported as part of village development plan. The BMUD can be used as a platform/ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessing the capacity and gaps of the Village Business units. - Training of leadership and trainers. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | medium that link the financial resources of conservation partnership funds and government village development funds and facilitate the communities / local NGOs in accessing these funds for livelihood development. The mentoring approach could be part of cross-cutting activities for selected interventions. | |
| 5. Developing NTFPs activities such as animal breeding, agarwood (gaharu), orchid and bee keeping | 5 | The intervention will help to diversify the household livelihood incomes. Development of NTFP activities could be carried out inside and outside the NP. NTFP activities not only create new jobs for villages but also encourage conservation effort by villages. This intervention also contributes to WKNP tourism features that offer diverse products. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification and delineation of suitable plots (PLUP). - Clarification of user-rights and obligations. - Identify suitable NTFP activities for further development which include assessment of market demand and value, cost effectiveness, and the capacity of communities. - Assess the impact of NTFP activities towards the NP conservation. - Evaluate any recent changes in house-hold incomes who already engaged in this sector. - Training of communities in developing identified NTFP activities. |
| 6. Assistance and creation of nursery gardens for the provision of ecosystem restoration, elephants and rhinos feeds, commercial community logging on community lands | 5 | There is existing demand for agro-tourism and restoration activities. The nursery gardens will also create job opportunities and reduce pressure of NP for community logging. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify endemic species that could be cultivate and grow easily for restoration activities and for wildlife feeds. - Assess the impact of the introduction and evaluate any recent changes in house-hold incomes. - Training of cultivating seedling, nursery management. |
| 7. Biogas installation as demonstration plot for fuel wood substitution | 3 | The intervention aims to reduce pressure of communities logging for fuel wood. The inputs come from manure of livestock (mainly from cattle raising). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feasibility study of cost effectiveness of biogas installation. - Training for operation and maintenance of biogas. |
| 8. Making fishing ponds as tourism site destination | 2 | There are existing fish cultivation ponds which are still lack of capacity in improving their productions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training for existing fish pond operators to enhance their production and fish ponds management. - Improve capacity of waste water management of fish pond to avoid environmental pollution. - Feasibility study on fishing farms as tourism selling points |

| | | | |
|---------------|---|---|--|
| 9. Ecotourism | 4 | <p>This intervention is limited to Braja Harjosari or current villages that exhibit capacity in Community based tourism. Although there is high potential for Braja Harjosari to invest in this sector, there should be integration of works between WKNP management and the concern Village government prior to further investment and to avoid tourism development which could jeopardize the NP conservation effort. At present, little integration and synergies of work were observed. More attention should also be paid to identify/delineate of targeted areas for tourism activities for ensuring tourist safety. Services facilities such as health check clinics should be improved for supporting further development of this sector.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study of current tourism activities in Braja Harjosari and their impacts to WKNP - Delineate the areas for eco-friendly tourism - Identify villages (max. 5) other than Braja Harjosari that have potential for eco-friendly tourism. - Identify the capacity and gaps of these villages for eco-friendly tourism. - Identify tourism activities that are suitable for each selected village for eco friendly tourism. - Training and strengthening communities in eco-friendly tourism, including operation, facilities, infrastructure, services and marketing. - Support to establishing a WKNP certified tour and park guide. - Seek cooperation with tourism training facilities. - Awareness strengthening and knowledge building for guide associations/community tour guides on ecological friendly tourism, conservation of NP and endangered species; i.e. elephants, tigers, rhinos etc.; traditional knowledge on wild / medicinal plants; history and local culture. - Strengthening the NP administration in administering and monitoring visitors, tourism activities, and operation of tour guides. |
|---------------|---|---|--|

Following the matrices showed above and detail evaluation in Annex 1, the highest priority interventions are related to NTFP and agriculture development activities which contribute to biodiversity conservation, improve living conditions of local communities, create job opportunities especially for women and youth. The “High Priority” interventions are related to establishment of tree/seedling nursery that produce feed for wildlife/animals as part of wildlife encroachment reduction measure, and improvement of local industry and market access, and ecotourism.

Although there is strong interest in further developing the ecotourism sector in both AHPs, attention should be paid to defining clear concept of “ecotourism” that are sustainable, in which “eco- or environmental friendly tourism” and community based tourism are integrated as basic steps. Priority should be given to tourism activities that contribute to both conservation work and improve livelihood of communities. Further inputs on analysing the current status of tourism activities in targeted areas from ecotourism specialists are critical to ensure selected tourism interventions do not jeopardise the conservation works in both AHPs. Selection of sites for the intervention should also be defined prior to further development. Besides “eco-friendly tourism”, community-based tourism which supports

conservation of NP could be tapped and further developed. In addition, the related sectors to tourism such as production and services sectors (health, agriculture and food, marketing, communications etc.) which offers substantial job opportunities remain untapped.

Synergies among governmental agencies such as forestry department, cultural and tourism, village/rural development in developing sustainable ecotourism are critical to ensure successful implementation which in return will enhance the economic growth of the communities. . Clear policy/policies on tourism development in the buffer zone or adjacent areas to AHPs or protected areas should be established prior to the implementation.

4.0 SGP packages recommendations

Under the second phase of grant support by the SGP, the grant will focus on the two sub-programmes on livelihoods; i.e. Community Development and Ecotourism. **The SGP packages for this assignment focus only on highest and high priority interventions which are not related to ecotourism interventions.** The ecotourism related interventions need further inputs by eco-tourism specialist in order to come up with more concrete guidelines for the appraisal of related proposals to this sector. Cross cutting interventions such as Community Outreach and Conservation Awareness, and Ecosystem Restoration and Rehabilitation can be included as part of activities of livelihood interventions.

SGP should be implemented in accordance with the GLNP and WKNP Management Plans in which all inventions implementation should seek for stakeholder ownership through strengthening their involvement in the developing livelihood activities. Consideration of socio-cultural aspects in its activities is also important element to be integrated to ensure long-term support from stakeholder and community for the protection of both AHPs.

The selection criteria which are described in the PMM are valid and relevant. Due to limited grants for investment, interventions that **scored 5** based on the matrix table 3.1 and 3.2, are recommended to be included into the CfP 2. Interventions that scored **4** could be considered for CfP 2. Having said that, appraisal should be given priority to proposals which address interventions that score 5. Besides, it is also recommended that selected proposals to include 2-3 suggested activities and partly or fully addressing at least one cross-cutting thematic areas.

Activities proposed by grantees should also conform to the white and black lists of activities written in the PMM.

4.1 GLNP SGP packages

Objective (based on CMP): Improve local community benefits sharing in order encourage local participation in preserving cultural and natural values of GLNP

Highest priority interventions:

- I. Community forestry / agroforestry enhancement by undertaking community based-NTFP development
- II. Community – based sustainable agriculture and livestock raising
- III. Establishment of farmers and other relevant stakeholders to tourism industry

High priority interventions:

- IV. Community-based tree planting and natural feeds plants for wildlife in designated agreed locations
- V. Training on local products making, create more diversify processing and post production
- VI. Establishment of networking on local products makers to market
- VII. Ecotourism

Expected outcomes:

- I. Local communities are able to legally access the resources NPs in sustainable way and reduce illegal activities by at least 20%.
- II. The livelihood income of local communities is increased through improved sustainable farming and livestock raising skills, market access of their products.
- III. At least 20% of youth, women and vulnerable groups will be able to find jobs or set up small enterprises.
- IV. Increase of awareness of local communities and local NGOs on biodiversity conservation and sustainable harvest of resources.

Corresponding indicators for the selected interventions:

- I. Number of community forest being established
- II. Number of local communities obtain legal documents to access the agreed NP buffer zone for harvesting of resources
- III. Number of recorded illegal activities
- IV. Number of nurseries are set up for seedlings for wildlife feed and selected NTFP / orchids
- V. Number of farmers have direct market access / broaden their market access
- VI. Number of farmers whose productivity have increased through improved skills in farming and livestock raising
- VII. Number of NTFP is identified and further developed for cultivation/ and market
- VIII. Number of local made product / handicraft is identified, developed and marketed
- IX. Size of areas allocated for cultivation of wildlife feed
- X. Number of new small businesses
- XI. Number of youth and women involved in directly /indirectly in the selected interventions
- XII. Number of relevant training and workshops for the selected interventions

Recommended activities for**Intervention I**

- Legalization/ registration of community forests including the agreement between NP management and villages.
- Delineation of community forestry areas and pre-dominant land-use type.
- Establishment of pilot community forests in Tangkahan, Bukit Lawang, Bekantan if requires.
- Feasibility study of identified NTFP and the possible establishment of benefit sharing e.g. Payment for Ecosystem (PES).
- Assess the impact of collection of medicinal plants, wild honey, rattan, fishing and hunting activities towards the conservation and socio economy of communities.
- Establish guidelines for community monitoring on the NTFP.
- Trainings on sustainable collection of medicinal plants/wild honey/fishing.
- Introducing certification of NTFP (if needed). This could be facilitated by CIFOR Indonesia/FSC international.
- Conduct value chain analysis and establish direct market access to potential buyers.

Intervention II

- Demonstration plots for smart / sustainable agriculture.
- Feasibility study of potential agriculture produce (both crops and livestock) that are suitable to be cultivated or raised. The study should include the potential for local and regional market and its value chain.
- Assessment of farmers' needs (techniques/ equipment) and capacity for the identified agriculture activities.
- Training of the use of modern / local adaptable technology for harvesting, storage and compost making.
- Training of the use of fencing, plants/ trees for reduction of wildlife encroachment.

Intervention III (relevant activities that are directly related to tourism will be elaborated further in next mission)

- Support to establishing a GLNP certified tour and park guide.
- Seek cooperation with tourism training facilities.
- Identify interested farmers to supply their production to restaurant, homestays, guest-houses.
- Assess service requirements v/s potential guest groups.
- Assess the cuisine offered in the restaurants, homestays, guest-houses.
- Training of planting crops/ vegetables or raising livestock for production.
- Training of standard production.
- Facilitation of networking between farmers – tourism stakeholders.

Intervention IV

- Identification and delineation of suitable plots (PLUP) with close cooperation of park managers.
- Clarification of user-rights and obligations.
- Assess which types of trees/ crops for suitable for enrichment of wildlife feed.
- Assess the impact of the introduction. Study by IPB students to be used for further reference.
- Establishment of nursery for seedlings.
- Training of tree / crops/ wildlife feed planting.
- Training of seedlings production.

Intervention V

- Identify local products / handicrafts that have unique selling points.
- Training needs assessment.
- Feasibility study for value chain, quality considerations / control, and cost effectiveness of introduction of processing and post production.
- Cooperative organisation training.
- Upscaling the existing local products industry with emphasis on quality control.
- Green business management training

Intervention VI

- Identify potential buyers, potential district/regional market.
- Evaluate the potentials for coop-type marketing.
- Facilitate the negotiation between farmers/NTFP collectors and buyers.
- Equip farmers' knowledge on quality management and control, marketing skill and the quality of production including packaging.
- Training of farmers in market price negotiation.

Intervention VII (the sub interventions and relevant activities will be elaborated more in next mission)

- Review and assess the existing tourism activities and its impacts to conservation work of GLNP.
- Identify the gaps in operating ecological friendly tourism e.g. facilities/infrastructure.
- Identify which entry points for each targeted area for implementation of eco-friendly tourism; this includes assessing the capacity in introducing eco-tourism certification.
- Awareness strengthening and knowledge building for guide associations/community tour guides on ecological friendly tourism, conservation of NP and endangered species; i.e. orangutan, elephant, tigers etc.; traditional knowledge on wild / medicinal plants; history and local culture.
- Strengthening the NP management in administering and monitoring visitors, tourism activities, operation of tour guides.
- Support to establishment of GLNP certified tour and park guide.
- Seek cooperation with national tourism training facilities.

4.2 WKNP SGP packages

Objective: Utilizing natural resources and ecosystem of WKNP for the independence and welfare of the surrounding community

Highest priority interventions:

- I. Developing NTFPs activities such as animal breeding, agarwood (gaharu), orchid and bee keeping
- II. Assistance and creation of nursery gardens for the provision of ecosystem restoration, elephants and rhinos feeds, commercial community logging on community lands

High priority interventions:

- III. Facilitating on community involvement in organic farming activities
- IV. Legal access of cooperation (MoU) and empowerment of business units group on NTFP developers such as Agrarwood nursery, orchids and honey
- V. Ecotourism

Expected Outcomes:

- I. The livelihood income of local communities is increased through improved sustainable farming and livestock raising skills, market access of their products.
- II. At least 20% of youth, women and vulnerable groups will be able to find jobs or set up small enterprises.
- III. Increase of awareness of local communities and local NGOs on biodiversity conservation and sustainable harvest of resources.
- IV. Local communities are able to legally access the resources NPs in sustainable way and reduce illegal activities by at least 20%.

Corresponding indicators for the selected interventions:

- I. Number of community forest being established
- II. Number of local communities obtain legal documents to access the agreed NP buffer zone for harvesting of resources
- III. Number of recorded illegal activities
- IV. Number of nurseries are set up for seedlings for wildlife feed and selected NTFP / orchids
- V. Number of farmers have increased productivity through improved skills in farming and livestock raising
- VI. Number of NTFP is identified and further developed for cultivation/ and market
- VII. Number of new small businesses
- VIII. Number of youth and women involved in directly /indirectly in the selected interventions
- IX. Number of relevant training and workshops for the selected interventions

Recommended activities for

Intervention I

- Identification and delineation of suitable plots (PLUP).
- Clarification of user-rights and obligations.
- Identify suitable NTFP activities for further development which include assessment of market demand and value, cost effectiveness, and the capacity of communities.
- Assess the impact of NTFP activities towards the NP conservation.
- Evaluate any recent changes in house-hold incomes who already engaged in this sector.
- Training of communities in developing identified NTFP activities

Intervention II

- Identify endemic species that could be cultivate and grow easily for restoration activities and for wildlife feeds.
- Assess the impact of the introduction and evaluate any recent changes in house-hold incomes.

- Training of cultivating seedling, nursery management

Intervention III

- Demonstration plots for organic farming. Using the demonstration plots to sensitize communities on organic/natural farming and identify the interested farmers.
- Feasibility study of potential agriculture produce (both crops, fruit trees and livestock) that are suitable to be cultivate and their market value, including assessment of farmers' needs and capacity.
- Training of interested farmers on the organic farming techniques including use of natural predators to control diseases, making of composting to increase soil fertility.
- Training of seeds collection.
- Training of local adaptable technology for harvesting and storage.
- Training of the use of fencing, plants/ trees for reduction of wildlife encroachment.
- Upscaling of organic farming in Braja Harjasari.
- Facilitating market linkage (local and Sumatra region).

Intervention IV

- Delineation of community forestry areas and pre-dominant land-use type
- Legally correct establishment and registration of community forestry including an agreement on rights and obligations.
- Establishing community forestry and partnership with NP administration.
- Feasibility study of identified NTFP businesses and the possible establishment of benefit sharing e.g. PES.
- Establish guidelines for community monitoring on the NTFP.
- Establish direct market access to potential buyers.
- Training on green business management and marketing

Intervention V (This intervention will be further elaborated in the following mission-ecotourism)

- Study of current tourism activities in Braja Harjosari and their impacts to WKNP
- Delineate the areas for eco-friendly tourism
- Identify villages (max. 5) other than Braja Harjosari that have potential for eco-friendly tourism.
- Identify the capacity and gaps of these villages for eco-friendly tourism.
- Identify tourism activities that are suitable for each selected village for eco-friendly tourism.
- Training and strengthening communities in eco-friendly tourism, including operation, facilities, infrastructure, services and marketing.
- Support to establishing a WKNP certified tour and park guide.
- Seek cooperation with tourism training facilities.
- Awareness strengthening and knowledge building for guide associations/community tour guides on ecological friendly tourism, conservation of NP and endangered species; i.e. elephants, tigers, rhinos etc.; traditional knowledge on wild / medicinal plants; history and local culture.
- Strengthening the NP administration in administering and monitoring visitors, tourism activities, and operation of tour guides.

4.3 Criteria-based for selection of proponents

The matrix of questions below is customized based on the aims of the CfP to compliment the criteria given in the PMM for Indonesia. The developed question-matrix can be included into Step 3 of the 10 steps Administrative Review of SGP-PMM.

The question-matrix is an easy-to-use questionnaire which requires only the answers "Yes" and "No" in order to decide, if a SGP project proposal is formally acceptable for implementation. Proposals, which were accepted, have to be, as defined in step 4, presented to the National Working Team (NWT) and ACB Regional Programme Coordination Unit (RPCU), for Substantive Review and Evaluation.

Question Matrix

| 1. Questions: Criteria for exclusion (If one or more questions are answered with YES, the proposal has to be excluded.) | | YES | NO |
|---|---|------------|-----------|
| 1.1 | Does the proposal violate Indonesian legislation or the principles of cooperation between Republic of Indonesia and Germany? | | |
| 1.2 | Does the proposal violate regulations or principles of the Management Plan and its annexes of the National Park? | | |
| 1.3 | Does the proposal have negative impacts on natural resources or the biodiversity of affected ecosystems or includes the introduction of non-native species into protected areas? | | |
| 1.4 | Does the proposal cause or increase conflicts within the community, between communities or between community and NP administration or social groups, including women? | | |
| 1.5 | Does the investment is to be used for large infrastructure, e.g. roads or large construction? | | |
| 1.6 | Does the proposal aim at the re-settlement or displacement of people or communities? | | |
| 1.7 | Is expenditure planned for weapons and ammunition, alcohol, tobacco or any illegal substances? | | |
| 1.8 | Does the proposal involve payments of regular salaries or other staff costs for government officials or the implementing agency? | | |
| 2. Criteria for inclusion, questions for realization: (At least, one of the questions have to be answered with YES) | | | |
| | | YES | NO |
| 2.1 | Does the proposal aim at the improvement of the collaborative management of the NP? | | |
| 2.2 | Does the proposal aim at community outreach and conservation awareness, including village meetings, meetings with problem households, activities with students, training, public relation, print media, websites and its equipment? | | |
| 2.3 | Does the proposal aim at community development, including extension officers, training, meetings, excursions, development of regulations, implementation of development plans and its equipment? | | |
| 2.4 | Does the proposal aim at ecotourism, including training of local guides, production of information material about biodiversity and cultural and traditional values? | | |
| 2.5 | Does the proposal aims at sector policy development or improvement for natural resource and protected area management, livelihood development, research and analysis, in response to an arising and urgent need? | | |
| 3. Criteria of expected impact and sustainability: (If questions are answered with NO, the proposal should be negotiated again with the applicants.) | | | |
| | | YES | NO |
| 3.1 | Does the proposal provide a clear, logical relationship between the problem statement, the objective of the project, and the activities proposed? | | |
| 3.2 | Does the proposal aim at solving of a critical problem, which could not be managed by the people themselves? | | |
| 3.3 | Does the proposal include one of the prioritized interventions (score 5 or 4) and include 2-3 suggested activities under prioritized interventions? | | |
| 3.4 | Does the proposal's expected outputs correlate to the indicators of prioritized interventions | | |
| 3.5 | Does the project help to improve livelihoods of unprivileged social groups or supports the socio-economic stability of the community? | | |
| 3.6 | Does the proposal submitted by community representatives, more than two user | | |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| | groups, an association or cooperative supported by its members? | | |
| 3.7 | Do all members of the group of applicants will benefit from the successful implementation of the project? | | |
| 3.8 | Are the direct beneficiaries willing to contribute monetary or non-monetary to the implementation of the project proposal? | | |
| 3.9 | Is capacity building, especially practical training of direct beneficiaries, part of the project? | | |
| 3.10 | Does the proposal support biodiversity conservation and long-term ecological sustainability? | | |
| 3.11 | Does the project include a clear implementation and technical monitoring concept with clearly defined responsibilities of all stakeholders? | | |
| 3.12 | Does the project could be implemented within one year or given time? | | |
| 3.13 | Could the proposal, after its successful implementation, be used as a model for other areas or communities or up-scaled? | | |

5.0. Other Recommendations for NP-management

During the field visits, following issues were raised and reflected in the summarized recommendations for improvement as follows:

1. Monitoring and control of visitor's entrance and movement, and illegal activities:
 - Installation of visible cameras at entrances especially at gates, where tourists enter the National Park will improve control over the protected areas.
 - To control illegal activities, camera-traps with live-control can be installed at known entrance points and other sensible spots within the National Park. Information should be observed at 24-hour duty stations in order to react immediately and accordingly.
 - Use of a camera drone for aerial control and regular monitoring. Images can be transmitted to the main offices for analysis, processing and storage.
2. Mitigation measures of human-wildlife conflicts especially by elephants during harvest season:
 - Scaring practice with use of non-deadly weapons, e.g. shooting with rubber-bullets or tear-gas. In African countries signal ammunition was tested successfully against elephant attacks. In some countries, wildlife damage to agriculture is compensated by government. It is important to note, if animal do not learn to avoid the settled areas, the attacks will never stop. However, this scaring approach needs to consider the law and regulation of Indonesia as well as cultural practice of the local communities prior for implementation.
3. Control of the grass *Imperata cylindrica*, also known as cogon grass or kunai grass which causes hot fires and damages to other plants (especially trees). This grass is not only fire-resistant but spreads further by fires then become invasive and dominates the former forest-ecosystem.
 - Early burning, which is practised in several savannas and steppes to prevent uncontrolled "hot" fires, cannot be applied, because *Imperata cylindrica* will spread further and cannot be controlled in this way.
 - Creation of 10 m-belts where all vegetation is cleared away. In the second year, the legume *Mucuna pruriens* (Lacuna bean, known in Java as Benguk) should be cultivated at these belts. In Vietnam, the bean is used for biological control of *Imperata cylindrica*. After these two steps, the spreading of grass could be stopped and replaced by other vegetation. This approach needs further consideration to check its applicability and practicality according to the respective regulation of the NP.

The occurrence of forest fire in Indonesia is often caused by open burning which carried out by plantation. The more effective way to control spread of forest fire would be strengthening and enforcing the existing law and regulations for such offence as well as compelling the offenders to restore the damage areas.

6.0 Conclusions

Following the field visits to GLNP and WKNP, additional findings to the information written in CMPs are updated in chapter 2. The results of the findings and the information described in the CMPs of both AHPs and PMM of SGP Indonesia are used for further analysis to identify the priority interventions that are incorporated in the design of SGP packages for second call of proposal (CfP 2). The CfP 2 is scheduled to launch at the end of April 2020.

Due to limited grants for investment, interventions which score 5 (highest priority) and 4 (high priority) are recommended to be included in the CfP 2. The matrices in 3.1 and 3.2 provide justification and rationale behind the prioritization. A number of proposed activities are also included in the matrix as the guidelines to evaluate grantees' proposals. The table below presents the most prioritized interventions for both AHPs.

| GLNP | WKNP |
|--|--|
| Interventions categorized as Highest Priority (Score 5) | |
| Community forestry/ agroforestry enhancement by undertaking community based-NFTP development | Facilitating on community involvement in organic farming activities. |
| Community-based sustainable agriculture and livestock raising | Developing NTFPs activities such as animal breeding, agarwood (gaharu), orchid and bee keeping |
| Establishment of farmers and other stakeholders to tourism industry | |
| Interventions categorized as High Priority (Score 4) | |
| Community-based tree planting and natural feeds plants for wildlife in designated locations | Legal access of cooperation (MoU) and empowerment of business unit group on NTFP developers such as agarwood nursery, orchids and honey |
| Training on local products making, create more diversify processing & post-production | Assistance and creation of nursery gardens for the provision of ecosystem restoration, elephants and rhinos feeds, commercial community logging on community lands |
| Establishment of networking on local products makers to market | Ecotourism |
| Ecotourism | |

It is recommended that the interventions which related to ecotourism should be given further attention prior to implementation. The first step should be ensured the existing tourism eco-friendly activities, which is in the long run can be further developed into ecotourism. Additional inputs and advice from Ecotourism specialists should be seek.

Based on the prioritized interventions (score 5 and 4), the Consultant has drafted SGP packages for GLNP and WKNP. The packages comprise of objectives (based on the CMP), expected outcomes, corresponding indicators for selected interventions and proposed activities for each intervention. The recommended SGP packages for both NPs aim to assist the appraisal process for SGP investment. In addition, a matrix of questions was developed to ease the appraisal process. The matrix is a complimentary assessment to the criteria of selection stipulated in the PMM.

Annex 1: Evaluation of interventions

Intervention which scores more than 30 has the highest priority, 25 – 30 is high priority, 16 - 24 is moderate priority, 10 -15 is less priority and score which is below 10 is considered lowest priority.

Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP)

Intervention 1: Development of Community-based organization on livelihoods

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 2 | Only relevant if the organization integrate biodiversity conservation measures as part of their strategies |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 2 | The improved organization / leadership will help in better planning of village development. |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 4 | The capacity of village committees in planning and developing the village will be improved; awareness of NPs in village development and relevancy of NPs could increase if NPs are engaged. |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 2 | May indirectly contribute to creation of new opportunities |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 1 | Indirectly contribute to sustainable village development |
| Cost efficiency | 2 | It only cost effective with strong leadership |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 2 | This is a continual process and results could be only measured after 2-3 years of establishment |
| Total Score | 15 | Less priority |

Intervention 2: Training and coaching on institutional strengthening

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 2 | Build the awareness of green and sustainable management of parks |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 2 | Indirectly related through increased awareness on sustainable used of resources of NPs |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 5 | Improved organisation capacity will help to better manage the park, village planning and development |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 3 | Skill improvement of women and youth will facilitate them to get job easier or to run small businesses |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 1 | The resiliency will be improved when there is leadership steering the communities towards the sustainable development |
| Cost efficiency | 2 | Only cost effective when the skills / knowledge learned is put into practice |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 3 | The existing capacity and readiness of communities are still limited; this intervention needs continuous support and evaluation to assess if the targeted results are achieved |
| Total Score | 18 | Moderate priority |

Intervention 3: Community forestry/ agroforestry enhancement by undertaking community based-NFTP development

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 5 | Reduce illegal activities and pressure on NPs' resources through trust building and creating new businesses |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Improved livelihood incomes through creation of new opportunities for local communities |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 4 | Indirect contribution through on job training establishment of nurseries, bee keeping etc. helps to diversify the livelihood skills of local communities and NGOs; |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Develop more small businesses of NTFP – agrarwood, honey and other valuable medicinal plants |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 5 | Reduction of deforestation and illegal harvesting will ensure resource sustainability for continual access by local communities |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Multi-benefits with low-medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 5 | Most of the relevant activities (nursery set up, NTFP market access etc.) could be established within two years; |
| Total Score | 33 | Highest priority |

Intervention 4: Community-based sustainable agriculture and livestock raising

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 4 | Reduce reliance on NP resources; creates diversity through diversification of crops cultivation; |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Reduce exposure to harmful pesticides/ chemicals and improve livelihood income |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 3 | Indirect contribution through on job training in crops diversification, livestock raising, increase soil fertility; marketing of products |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Require extensive labour for tending farms; Create jobs - supply its product to the existing guesthouses and homestays |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 5 | The diversification of crops create better resiliency by not relying on one crop |
| Cost efficiency | 5 | Multiple benefits with low external inputs |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 4 | Most of the relevant activities (farms set up and composting etc.) could be established within two years; |
| Total Score | 31 | Highest priority |

Intervention 5: Community-based tree planting and natural feeds plants for wildlife in designated agreed locations

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 5 | Reduce illegal logging and deforestation; restore the damage ecosystem; reduce encroachment of wildlife |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 4 | Increase livelihood incomes through creation of new opportunities for local communities; |
| Contribute to capacity and support of | 5 | Improve knowledge and skills of reforestation and |

| | | |
|---|-----------|--|
| the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | | restoration of wildlife habitat of NPs, NGOS and local communities |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 4 | job opportunities e.g. cash for work for restoration; establishment of nurseries for tree seedling |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 4 | Restored forests will provide new NTFP for local communities |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Multi-benefits with low medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 4 | Most of the relevant activities (nursery set up, restoration activities etc.) could be established within two years; |
| Total Score | 30 | High priority |

Intervention 6: Training on local products making, create more diversify processing & post-production

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 2 | Only valid if the products are sustainable harvested from the NPs and reduce the demand pressure from NPs |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Improved livelihood incomes, established market places, procurement of machines for processes will improve the living quality of the communities |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 4 | Enhance and diverse skills of livelihood of communities especially youth and women through trainings on handicrafts; processing of traditional medicinal plants / herbal plants for cosmetic / medicinal use etc. |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Will attract more locals to engage in setting up enterprises for local made products |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 4 | Locals reduce their dependency on NP resources |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 4 | Training / market access |
| Total Score | 28 | High priority |

Intervention 7: Establishment of networking on local products makers to market

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 4 | Reduce the illegal activities and pressure on NP resources |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Improved market access of farmers to sell their products will improve their livelihood income |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 0 | Not relevant |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 4 | Will attract more locals to engage in farming / livestock raising |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 5 | Locals reduce their dependency on NP resources |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Low investment with multiple benefits for adjacent communities that relies on farming |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 5 | Related activities could be implemented within 1 year |
| Total Score | 27 | High priority |

Intervention 8: Establishment of farmers and other relevant stakeholders (agro-forestry) to tourism industry (restaurants / accommodation)

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 4 | Reduce the illegal activities and pressure on NP resources |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Improved market access of farmers to sell their products will improve their livelihood income |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 3 | Indirect contribution through training in food safety; marketing of products |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Will attract more locals to engage in farming / livestock raising |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 4 | Locals reduce their dependency on NP resources |
| Cost efficiency | 5 | Multiple benefits with low investment; the tourism activities are well established in GLNP, the intervention will help boost local economic growth |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 5 | Related activities could be implemented within 1-2 years |
| Total Score | 31 | Highest priority |

Intervention 9: Ecotourism

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 3 | Only when the related activities are carried out in sustainable manner |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 4 | Up-scale of tourism infrastructure and relevant tourism activities (e.g. health posts, restaurants/ grocery shops) will improve living conditions |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 5 | Awareness raising activities and training on sustainable ecotourism will enhance the knowledge and skills of NPs, NGOs and communities / local tour guides |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Many related tourism job opportunities and small businesses can be developed |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 3 | Only relevant when it is sustainable |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 4 | Ecotourism is established in GLNP however the relevant activities are moving towards mass tourism; a clear guidelines need to be established for sustainable ecotourism |
| Total Score | 28 | High priority |

Way Kambas National Park (WKNP)

Intervention 1: Facilitating on community involvement in organic farming activities.

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 4 | Organic farming creates diversity through diversification of crops cultivation; |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 4 | Reduce exposure to harmful pesticides/ chemicals |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 3 | Will improve knowledge and skills in crops diversification, increase soil fertility; marketing of products |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Require extensive labour for tending farms; Create jobs - supply its product to the existing guesthouses and homestays |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 5 | The diversification of crops create better resiliency by not relying on one crop |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Low external inputs |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 3 | It takes at least one year to two years to see positive results |
| Total Score | 28 | High Priority |

Intervention 2: Improvement of institutional capacity of business groups

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 2 | Build the awareness of green management |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 2 | Only for those involve in business |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 5 | Improved business organisation will help to reduce debt. More women could be engaged in small businesses. |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 3 | May improve the skill of women and youth in business handling and create interest of local to set up small business |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 1 | The resiliency will be improved when there is leadership steering the communities towards the sustainable development |
| Cost efficiency | 2 | Only cost effective when the skills learned are put into practice |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 3 | The existing capacity and readiness of communities are still limited; this intervention needs continuous support and evaluation to assess if the targeted results are achieved |
| Total Score | 18 | Moderate priority |

Intervention 3: Legal access of cooperation (MoU) and empowerment of business units group on NTFP developers such as Agrarwood nursery, orchids and honey

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|---|-------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 4 | Facilitate the trust building between communities and NPs; also increase awareness of communities in protecting the NP as their livelihood directly depending on it; communities could also form volunteer patrolling groups to reduce illegal activities |
| Improve the living conditions of local | 4 | Legal access to community forest will reduce illegal |

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| communities | | activities; improve awareness of business groups will help to reduce deforestation and illegal harvesting. |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 4 | Training on green businesses, establishment of nurseries will improve capacity of communities, NPs and NGOs |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 4 | Awareness of business groups on the important of NTFP and its opportunity will facilitate business partnerships with locals, hence creates job opportunities and establishment of NTFP small businesses |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 3 | Improve awareness of business groups will help to reduce deforestation which is a factor of climate change |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Multi-benefits with low-medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 4 | Most of the relevant activities (e.g. delineation of community forest, training and awareness raising activities) could be established within one year; |
| Total Score | 27 | High priority |

Intervention 4: Mentoring and optimizing Village Business units as village economic institutions

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 0 | No relevancy to biodiversity conservation |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 2 | The improved village business units only benefiting limited groups |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 3 | The capacity of village committees in planning and developing the village will be improved; awareness of NPs in village development and relevancy of NPs could increase if NPs are engaged. |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 2 | The optimization of village business units may indirectly facilitate youth and women/ vulnerable groups in setting up new businesses |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 1 | Indirectly contribute to green management of the village |
| Cost efficiency | 2 | It only cost effective with strong leadership |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 2 | This is a continual process and results could be only measured after 2-3 years of establishment |
| Total Score | 12 | Less priority |

Intervention 5: Developing NTFPs activities such as animal breeding, agarwood (gaharu), orchid and bee keeping

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 5 | Reduce illegal activities through creating new businesses |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Ensure sustainable use of resources; new opportunities for local communities |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 4 | On job training establishment of orchids nurseries, bee keeping etc. helps to diversify the livelihood skills of local communities and NGOs; |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Develop more small business on NTFP – agarwood, orchids, honey and other valuable medicinal plants |
| Improve resiliency of communities | 5 | Reduction of deforestation and illegal harvesting |

| | | |
|---|-----------|--|
| towards climate change | | will ensure sustainable and control harvest for communities |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Multi-benefits with low-medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 5 | Most of the relevant activities (nursery set up, NTFP market access etc.) could be established within two years; |
| Total Score | 33 | Highest priority |

Intervention 6: Assistance and creation of nursery gardens for the provision of ecosystem restoration, elephants and rhinos feeds, commercial community logging on community lands

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-----------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 5 | Reduce illegal logging and deforestation; restore the damage ecosystem; |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Ensure sustainable use of resources; new opportunities for local communities; reduce encroachment of wildlife |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 5 | On job training establishment of nurseries and production of elephants and rhino feeds etc. helps to diversify the livelihood skills of local communities and NGOs; |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | create more small businesses and job opportunities |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 4 | restoration of deforestation and illegal logging will ensure sustainable and control harvest for communities |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Multi-benefits with medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 4 | Most of the relevant activities (nursery set up, restoration activities etc.) could be established within two years; |
| Total Score | 32 | Highest priority |

Intervention 7: Biogas installation as demonstration plot for fuel wood substitution

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|---|-----------|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 4 | Reduce deforestation |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 4 | Health improvement with less exposure to smoke |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institutions | 3 | Build capacity of operation and maintenance of biogas plot. |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 3 | Jobs related to operation and maintenance of the biogas plants; temporary labour- job for biogas installation |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 3 | Reduce deforestation |
| Cost efficiency | 2 | Medium high investment for fuel wood substitution |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 3 | The installation can be established within 1-2 years. However the operation and maintenance need continuous training for communities. |
| Total Score | 22 | Moderate priority |

Intervention 8: Making fishing ponds as tourism site destination

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
|---------------------|-------|---------|

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 0 | May be a risk to damage the conservation work |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 2 | The set-up of fish ponds need detail study including waste water management, unique selling point for tourism |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 2 | Indirect capacity support for communities; there is huge gap knowledge in setting up and managing fish ponds; |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 3 | Create opportunities for youth and business partnership for communities |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 2 | Communities are able to learn new livelihood skills but at the same time expose to contamination of water resources if the ponds are not managed well and in sustainable manner |
| Cost efficiency | 1 | High investment with high risk |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 2 | This need high operation and maintenance costs as well as marketing |
| Total Score | 12 | Less priority |

Intervention 9: Ecotourism

| Evaluation criteria | Score | Remarks |
|--|-------|--|
| Contribute to biodiversity conservation | 3 | Only when the related activities are sustainable |
| Improve the living conditions of local communities | 5 | Small infrastructure and relevant tourism activities (e.g. health posts, restaurants/ grocery shops) will improve living conditions |
| Contribute to capacity and support of the communities, NPs, NGOs and other institution | 4 | Awareness raising activities and training on sustainable ecotourism will improve the knowledge and skills of NPs, NGOs and communities |
| Create job opportunity to youth / women / vulnerable groups | 5 | Many related tourism job opportunities and small businesses can be developed |
| Improve resiliency of communities towards climate change | 3 | Only relevant when it is sustainable |
| Cost efficiency | 4 | Medium investment |
| Achievable results in the short and medium term | 3 | Ecotourism is still underdeveloped in WKNP; interventions such as capacity building, setting up better infrastructure need further improvement prior to full operation of ecotourism |
| Total Score | 27 | High priority |