

SYMFOR II WORKSHOP

15-17 November 2000

Hotel Santika, Jakarta

Workshop Report

Moray J McLeish, University of Edinburgh
(moray.mcleish@ed.ac.uk)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After the initial SYMFOR workshop in June it was decided to hold a half day presentation in Jakarta, to launch the workshop proceedings and present results of discussions / findings and plans to senior government officials from the Ministry of Forestry.

PROCESS

The objectives of this workshop were therefore as follows

- To launch the publication of the proceedings from the June workshop
- To present results and plans to senior forestry officials
- To have these plans criticised, strengthened and hopefully supported as a result of the process
- To improve the plans by extending the participation in planning to a wider range of stakeholders
- To generate any additional plans and proposals related to the SYMFOR concept

This report describes the activities undertaken in the workshop in order to meet the stated objectives, and evaluates the degree to which these objectives have been met. It then offers some conclusions and advice for future (similar) workshops.

Day 1 opened with an introduction from the Director General of PHP, before the four initiatives from the first workshop, and progress made upon them since then were then summarised in half hour slots, followed by questions and discussion on each. This formal presentation and discussion continued from 10.15 over lunch to 16.30.

On day 2 the participants were asked to join the group of their choice to work upon writing or improving the logical framework for each proposal. The process of logical framework writing was introduced and closely guided by LATIN. This activity continued until around 18.00, and several of the participants arranged to work later in the evening, due to enthusiasm and difficulties in getting to grips with the logical framework concept.

Day 3 commenced with the leader of each proposal making a presentation of the revised product to the workshop as a whole. Midway through the afternoon the group came together to consider how the four existing proposals could be interlinked, made to be more complementary, and clustered under one common 'supergoal'. A small team was assembled, responsible for integrating the four proposals and presenting them to DFID within two weeks.

COMMENTS

Many of the more senior participants were seen to leave the workshop after lunch on the first day. As one of the stated objectives of this workshop was to present results and plans to senior officials, this activity should have been strictly scheduled to take place and be completed within the first morning.

There was a much less formal approach during the second day and this precipitated participation from individuals who had not spoken on the first day. This atmosphere was encouraged in part by the absence of senior officials and in part by LATIN's style of facilitation and activities. This participative approach resulted in each proposal being strengthened as a result of being reviewed and modified by a multistakeholder group, and a greater feeling of 'ownership' of the proposals by their authors.

There was a feeling of fatigue on the third day, and probably the most important step taken forward was the decision to integrate the four proposals to a greater degree.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Key recommendations are as follows

1. In future, initial *presentation* of results should be clearly separated from discussion and development, with the target audience and their time constraints strictly in mind (section 4.1.2).
2. Indonesian counterparts in this and future work should be offered training in presentational/communication methods, to assist them in informing and advocating policy ideas to senior officials (section 4.2.1).
3. It is recommended that training should be provided to Indonesian counterparts in the preparation of realistic and effective project proposals, and the writing of logical frameworks (section 4.2.2).

1 OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

1.1.1 After the initial SYMFOR workshop in June - at which very few senior Indonesian forestry personnel were present - it was decided to hold a half day presentation in Jakarta, to launch the workshop proceedings and present results of discussions/findings/plans to senior government officials from the Ministry of Forestry.

1.1.2 The objectives of this workshop were therefore as follows

- To launch the publication of the proceedings from the June workshop
- To present results and plans to senior forestry officials
- To have these plans criticised, strengthened and hopefully supported as a result of the process

1.1.3 In the intervening period between June and November, the following further objectives were added

- To improve the plans by extending the participation in planning to a wider range of stakeholders
- To generate any additional plans and proposals related to the SYMFOR concept

1.1.4 This report describes the activities undertaken in the workshop in order to meet the stated objectives, and evaluates the degree to which these objectives have been met. It then offers some conclusions and advice for future (similar) workshops. A list of the workshop participants and a record of their attendance is included as Appendix I.

2 TIMETABLE, PROCESSES AND FACILITATION

2.1.1 The original timetable for the workshop was as attached in Appendix II. However, this was produced in the knowledge that at participatory workshops a large degree of flexibility is required. This timetable is included only for use as a reference point when reading the daily reports below.

2.2 DAY ONE

2.2.1 Day 1 opened with a formal introduction from the Director General of PHP, who spoke for half an hour, followed by an introduction from Pak Danie of Latin, and then a further introduction on behalf of the Edinburgh team by Moray McLeish. During this talk the draft copy of the proceedings from the June workshop (of which each participant had a copy) was mentioned.

2.2.2 Four of the initiatives from the first workshop, and progress made upon them since then were then summarised in half hour slots, followed by questions and discussion on each. This formal presentation and discussion continued from 10.15 over lunch to 16.30.

2.2.3 The participants were then split into two groups (randomly) and asked to consider the proceedings and come up with ten key points or questions from the day's presentations and discussions. One member of each group was asked to present the group's findings to the workshop the next morning.

2.3 COMMENTS UPON DAY ONE

2.3.1 There was a lot of interest in SYMFOR and the workshop process which has been used to bring the multistakeholder group together so far. This is illustrated by people such as Alex Heinrichs (GTZ) attending the workshop without being invited.

2.3.2 A number of the more senior participants were seen to leave the workshop as their contribution finished / as the day wore on. A stark example was the Dirjen PHP leaving as soon as he had finished his introduction. As one of the stated objectives of this workshop was to present results and plans from June to senior officials, this activity should have been strictly scheduled to take place and be completed within the first morning (at a maximum). By scheduling the presentations either side of lunch I feel that the opportunity to give a short, sharp, targetted presentation to senior officials was missed. In future, initial *presentation* of results should be clearly separated from discussion and development, with the target audience and their time constraints strictly in mind.

2.3.3 In order to capture the attention of the target audience, a summary of specific recommendations from the first workshop would have been useful. The draft copy of the proceedings from the first workshop was a sizeable and not particularly user friendly document.

2.3.4 Due to the formal presentation style used throughout most of the day, I observed a tiredness and lethargy growing in the participants as time passed.

The tendency of the more senior participants to talk at length and refuse interruption contributed to this. The participatory group work which took place at the end of the day did combat the tired atmosphere, but started a little too late in the day.

2.3.5 It was observed that a significant proportion of the participants had very little idea of what SYMFOR is and what it can and cannot do. In addition, two broad groups of participants emerged; those very technically orientated (coming mainly from the Ministry of Forestry and from Indonesian Universities) and those very socially orientated (coming mainly from NGOs).

2.4 DAY TWO

2.4.1 Day two opened with a participative game to break the ice and demonstrate the importance of planning and working together. The leader of each proposal (Herry, Pian, Redhahari and Soedirman, Bowo) then gave a short summary of their ideas and plans. Reports / lists of questions were then posed by each of the two groups from the first afternoon, and each of the proposal leaders was given the opportunity to respond.

2.4.2 There were no senior officials ('orang penting') present at this session, which I feel contributed to the open, enthusiastic and uninhibited discussion. Latin describes the objective of this session as "the integration of SYMFOR with wider group and forest management aims, trying to reconcile objectives". They presented the following framework to guide the discussion and help to locate each proposal within the bigger institutional picture.

PROJECT IDEA	GLOBAL ← SPHERE OF INFLUENCE → LOCAL			
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC INFLUENCES				
INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED				
MANAGEMENT OF PROJECT				
MANPOWER				
TOOLS				
2.4.3				

2.4.4 After lunch the participants were asked to join the group of their choice to work upon writing or improving the logical framework for each proposal. The process of logical framework writing was introduced and closely guided by LATIN. This activity continued until around 18.00, and several of the participants arranged to come back to the room at 19.30 to continue the work. Some worked until 22.00.

2.5 COMMENTS UPON DAY TWO

2.5.1 There was a much less formal approach during the second day and this seemed to encourage participation from individuals who had not spoken on the first day. This atmosphere was encouraged in part by the absence of senior officials and in part by LATIN's style of facilitation and activities.

2.5.2 A degree of 'grouping' was still evident amongst the participants, with some trying to assert the importance of 'their type' of forestry over others. There was possibly a lack of attention paid to identifying commonalities between all types of forest management, by a range of stakeholders. However open and constructive discussion which recognises conflicting views and objectives is an essential part of the project planning process, and in this case led to the following

- Each proposal being strengthened as a result of being reviewed and modified by a multistakeholder group,
- A greater feeling of 'ownership' by the participants of the proposals, evidenced by the enthusiasm and desire to work late into the night

2.5.3 The presence of a DFID (MFP) team member would have greatly assisted the process on the second day of the workshop. They could have assisted with the production of the draft logical frameworks and would have been able to address a number of specific questions about MFP. At least three participants asked directly 'where are DFID?' and I detected a strong feeling of disappointment at their absence. I think they would also have been impressed by the activities and enthusiasm in the process that they were financing.

2.5.4 Despite the excellent guidance given by LATIN on how to go about writing a project proposal/logical framework, this was a new exercise for many of the participants, and several were seen to struggle. There was not sufficient time in this workshop to go through the concepts and definitions of logical frameworks, as well as writing one. Several of the participants would benefit immensely from training in the preparation of realistic and effective project proposals, and the writing of logical frameworks.

2.6 DAY THREE

2.6.1 The third and final day of the workshop commenced with an hour for each group to work upon their logical framework, before making a presentation of the revised product to the workshop as a whole. This presentation was then subject to questions and discussion. Neil Scotland from the DFID (MFP) team and was present from 09.00-10.30 and again from 14.00-16.45.

2.6.2 It was evident that (in particular) the proposals which were at an advanced stage of development before the workshop (Curriculum and KalTim database) had benefitted considerably from the revision process. As a result of LATINs (and particularly Danie's) guidance, the authors recognised the need to sharpen their focus, streamline their proposals and spell out *exactly* what they plan to do and *how* they will do it.

2.6.3 Midway through the afternoon the group came together to consider how the four existing proposals could be interlinked, made to be more complementary,

and clustered under one common 'supergoal'. Again LATINs facilitation skills, vision and guidance were invaluable here (not to mention their ability to liven things up with amusing but relevant games and activities).

2.6.4 Late in the afternoon Neil Scotland indicated to the author that the next move should be to submit the proposals to DFID as soon as possible. As a result of this a small team was proposed, to be responsible for integrating the four proposals and presenting them to DFID within two weeks. The members of the 'tim kecil' were: the leader of each proposal plus; Pak Edi, Pak Agung, Moray McLeish.

2.6.5 The final discussion finished at 18.45, with the participants - who had been drifting off one by one all day - numbering only 8.

2.7 COMMENTS UPON DAY THREE

2.7.1 The enthusiasm which pervaded during day two was somewhat muted on the final day, and there was a feeling of tiredness. Probably the most important step taken forward was the decision to integrate the four proposals to a greater degree. However 1700 on a Friday afternoon at the end of a three-day workshop is not the ideal time to be doing such work. The few participants that were left were tired and concerned to be leaving.

2.7.2 There had been talk in the workshop of allowing the tim kecil 6 months to integrate the projects and put the final proposal together. This timeframe was unnecessarily long and therefore the advice from DFID to submit the proposals as soon as possible was valuable. Had it come earlier (through a greater/earlier DFID presence at the workshop) it may have saved a lot of time and unnecessary discussion.

2.7.3 The composition of the tim kecil is important. It has been selected so that each of the four proposals is represented, and so that links with the Ministry of Forestry and APHI (as well as Edinburgh University) are maintained. Thus the idea of bringing a diverse range of stakeholders to work together is continued.

2.8 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

2.8.1 A great deal of coming and going was observed amongst all the participants over the three days. This is probably due to the workshop location being in Jakarta and the proximity of many of the participants to their offices etc. In future, greater thought should be given to matching workshop objectives with workshop duration and location.

2.8.2 A great deal of networking was done between all participants, particularly during days two and three. This is a valuable process and outcome in itself¹, regardless of its contribution to the immediate outputs of the workshop.

¹ An example of the value of this networking process is the opportunity which has arisen, as a result of the workshop, to bring two or more of the participants and their respective organisations together to learn from each other, with a 'Shared Learning' grant from MFP.

3 OUTCOMES

3.1 GENERAL

3.1.1 As a result of the processes and activities employed during the workshop, the following tangible outcomes have been developed or added to what was in existence before the workshop

- Four individual project proposals, one of which newly created during the workshop
- A multistakeholder tim kecil has been created, responsible for integrating the four proposals and presenting them to DFID within two weeks of the end of the workshop. (This is an important milestone reached, in a process which was started in June)

3.1.2 In addition, the following less tangible, but equally important outcomes have been produced

- A much greater feeling of 'ownership' of the proposals by their authors, and a feeling of greater enthusiasm as a result
- A greater team spirit within and between the proposals, particularly encouraged by the decision to 'cluster' the proposals under one common supergoal

3.2 THE FIVE STATED OBJECTIVES

3.2.1 The 5 objectives of this workshop are stated in Section 1. These are repeated here, followed by the authors opinion of the degree to which each individual objective was met

- **To launch the publication of the proceedings from the June workshop**

3.2.2 This objective was not met. A draft copy of the proceedings was distributed to each participant, but was not referred to explicitly. In addition, it was still very much in draft form, and therefore is not likely to receive much attention, particularly from the target audience. This is an opportunity missed to present a concise, professional publication to an influential and diverse group. It is expected that the proceedings of the June 2000 workshop will be published during 2001

- **To present results and plans to senior forestry officials**

3.2.3 Results and plans were presented between 10.15 and 16.30, however the majority of the 'senior officials' had left by mid morning, and all were absent after lunch. Therefore this objective was not met satisfactorily. This should have been a concise and strictly timetabled activity.

- **To have these plans criticised, strengthened and hopefully supported as a result of the process**

3.2.4 In terms of having the plans criticised, strengthened and supported *by senior officials* this objective was not met, due to the scheduling shortcomings outlined above.

- **To improve the plans by extending the participation in planning to a wider range of stakeholders**

3.2.5 This objective was successfully met, and exceeded. The discussion above outlines the processes used to dissect the plans in a multistakeholder forum and reconstruct them with a sharper and more complementary focus. The results of this process are more robust project proposals, accompanied by a much greater feeling of ownership. Even if this was the only objective met, then I would consider the workshop a great success.

- **To generate any additional plans and proposals related to the SYMFOR concept**

3.2.6 This objective was also successfully met, on two counts. Firstly, a fourth project proposal on Komminiti Forestri was brought into being, to be coordinated by LATIN working alongside two NGOs from Samarinda and one from Manado. Secondly, the idea to integrate all the proposals and the creation of a team responsible for doing this is likely to strengthen the whole initiative, and has created a body of committed individuals which should ensure continuity of the process (both before the submission of proposals to DFID, and over the coming months).

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1.1 The opportunity to launch the proceedings and present results from June's workshop to senior officials was largely missed. This was due to inappropriate scheduling of activities. In future presentations to senior officials should be kept very short (one morning at the longest) and should be strictly timetabled.
- 4.1.2 The objectives of any similar gathering in the future must be clearly set out in advance. These will dictate the composition of the audience (or the selection of participants), the location of the gathering and the timetabling of activities. In this case, it would have been more desirable to make a short, half day *presentation* to senior officials in Jakarta, followed by a *participatory workshop* outside Jakarta. This would solve the problem of short attendance by senior officials, and stop the coming and going of other participants over the three days.
- 4.1.3 It is felt that a workshop of three days duration is too long. In future this problem can be solved in conjunction with the two points above. Finishing a participatory workshop on a Friday afternoon is also not desirable, as many of the participants had to leave before the end, and were therefore not present for the conclusion and scheduling of continuing work.
- 4.1.4 The process of dissection and reconstruction of the logical frameworks by a multistakeholder group has strengthened each initiative immeasurably. LATIN played a professional and invaluable role in facilitating this. This has contributed to a greatly increased feeling of ownership of the proposals and the process, which is regarded as essential for success of any activities in the medium to long term .
- 4.1.5 The creation of a tim kecil to work upon integrating the four proposals, and the setting of a deadline for presentation to DFID, are essential steps towards a milestone in a process of discussion which started in June. In addition the tim kecil is an essential 'body of continuity' which should bridge the gap between the end of the workshop and the start of any activities funded by DFID as a result of the workshop.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.2.1 With reference to paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, it is recommended that Indonesian counterparts in this and future work are given training in presentational/communication methods, to assist them in informing and advocating policy ideas to senior officials.
- 4.2.2 With reference to section 2.5.4 it is recommended that training is provided to Indonesian counterparts in the preparation of realistic and effective project proposals, and the writing of logical frameworks.

5 APPENDIX I : PARTICIPANTS

The participants on days one, two and three of the workshop were as follows

Individual	Organisation		Days attended			
1	Ir. M. D. Kusnandar	Dirjen PHP	Govt	X		
2	Franke Flasche	GTZ	Donor	X		
3	Nopilus	SHK Kaltim	NGO	X	X	X
4	Helmayetti Hamid	IFSA / IPB	Univ	X	X	X
5	Hery Setyono	PT Inhutani III	Industry	X		
6	Triwarno Seputro	PT Kiani Lestari	Industry	X		
7	Bachrizal Bakri	PT Inhutani II	Industry	X	X	X
8	Arif Aliadi	LATIN	NGO	X	X	X
9	Ali Solikhin	IFSA / IPB	Univ	X	X	X
10	Redhahari	UNMUL / Ybphl	Univ	X	X	X
11	Soeyitno Soedirman	UNMUL / Ybphl	Univ	X	X	X
12	Hari Kaskoyo	UNILA	Univ	X	X	X
13	Eman Hidayat	PT Sarpatim	Industry	X	X	
14	Ganip	LATIN	NGO	X		
15	Wibowo Djatmiko	LATIN	NGO	X	X	X
16	Edy Sardjono	Badan Planologi	Govt	X	X	X
17	Alex Heinrichs	GTZ	Donor	X		
18	Onu La Ola, SE. MS	IPB & Univ. Haluoleo	Univ	X		
19	Ruslandi	BFMP & APHI	Donor	X	X	X
20	Fatrah Dikusumah	Alas Kusama	NGO	X		
21	Paian Sianturi	IPB	Univ	X	X	X
22	Heri Purnomo	IPB & CIFOR	Int Org	X	X	X
23	Jusupta Tarigan	Alamanda	NGO	X		
24	Heru Komarudin	EU Forest Liaison Bureau	EU	X		
25	Marianti A Sumo	Yayasan Kelola Manado	NGO	X	X	X
26	Aminuddin	BIOMA	NGO	X	X	X
27	Nanang RA	Persaki	NGO	X		
28	Kusnani	PHA	Govt	X	X	
29	Ngadiono	Adi Sanggoro	NGO	X		
30	Djuhendi Tadjudin	Handal	NGO	X	X	X
31	Agung Priyo Sarjono	APHI	Industry		X	X
32	Neil Scotland	DFID – MFP	Donor			X
33	Moray McLeish	Univ of Edinburgh / FRP	Donor	X	X	X

Those invited but who did not attend included: Chay Asdak (UNPAD), Ridwan (formerly BIOTROP), Suryo Hardiwinoto (UGM), Stepi Hakim (GTZ – SFDP), Anthony P. Manalu (Sumalindo), Agua Djuanda (PT Ema Djulijawati), PT ITCI, Sarmiento, John Keating (EU – FLB), Graham Tyrie (BFMP), NRM II.

6 APPENDIX II : WORKSHOP TIMETABLE

DAY I (15 November 2000)	DAY 2 (16 November 2000)	DAY 3 (17 November 2000)
<p><u>Opening by Dirjen PHP</u> (08.30 – 09.00)</p> <p><u>Orientation</u> (09.00-10.00) Launch of Proceedings, workshop I Introduction – Moray McLeish Break (10.00 – 10.15)</p> <p><u>Reporting Results from Workshop I :</u> (10.15 – 12.30) 1. Forest policy and decentralisation in KalTim, background to proposals Pak Redhahari, UMUL .</p> <p>2. SYMFOR User Group, Pak Paian Sianturi,</p> <p>Lunch (12.30 – 13.30)</p> <p><u>Reporting Results from Workshop I :</u> (13.30-15.00) 3. Curriculum Development and Education, Heri Purnomo 4. Application of SYMFOR to Community Forestry, Ganip Gunawan and Bowo Wibowo</p> <p>Break (15.00 – 15.30)</p> <p><u>Discussion of Draft Proposals</u> (in groups) 1. Case studies and the application of SYMFOR to Community Forestry by Ganip Gunawan 2. Starting the SYMFOR user group, Paian Sianturi 3. Starting the Curriculum Development Group, Herry Purnomo 4. KalTim database and village land use project proposals, Redhahari & Soedirman</p>	<p><u>SWOT Analysis</u> (08.30 – 10.00) Method: Group discussion (Disko)</p> <p>Break (10.00 – 10.15)</p> <p><u>Presentation of Group discussion conclusions</u> Method : Delphi (10.15 – 11.00)</p> <p><u>Formulating a strategy</u> (11.00 –12.45) Metode : Disko berdasarkan hasil analisis SWOT Lunch (12.45 – 13.45)</p> <p><u>Plenary discussion</u> of the above strategy (13.45-15.00)</p> <p>Break (15.00-15.30)</p> <p><u>Writing / revising logical frameworks</u> (15.30 -17.00)</p>	<p><u>Assessing resources required,</u> Human resources, Funding (08.30-10.00) Method : Disko</p> <p>Break (10.00 – 10.15)</p> <p><u>Presentation of results of discussion</u> Method : Delphi (10.15 –12.30)</p> <p>Lunch (12.30 – 13.30)</p> <p><u>Action plan :</u> (13.30-15.30) 1. Who will write / present proposals 2. How can results from this workshop be fed into policy 3. Formulate activities, leaders and timetables</p> <p>Break (15.00-15.30)</p> <p><u>Closing</u> (15.30 –16.00)</p>