

## **Workshop Report**

### **Indicators for evaluation of management effectiveness for Sebesi Island Marine Sanctuary**

This report summarised the process and results of the first workshop in the preparation of an evaluation of management effectiveness of the Sebesi Island Marine Sanctuary (SIMS). The workshop was held on 14 December at the Pensanggrahan meeting area on Sebesi Island. Participants included members from: the evaluation team, the management body, a local fishermen's association, local tourism operations, a coral reef conservation group, and local government.

### **Background**

The workshop followed two weeks of semi-structured interviews and preparation focussed on determining the information needs and views on evaluation from a variety of stakeholders involved with the SIMS. Some of the results of these interviews were presented at the workshop to help the participants understand some of the issues that the evaluation team had encountered while talking to people about the SIMS.

### **Purpose**

The main purpose of the workshop was to discuss some of the results from the interviews, choose a target audience for the eventual evaluation report, to develop a list of indicators for an evaluation of management effectiveness of SIMS, and to prioritise those indicators based on the target audience's primary information needs.

### **Participants**

Participants at the workshop included:

#### *Evaluation Team:*

Nancy  
Indra  
Hero  
Nofive  
A Yani

#### *Others (local gov, coral conservation group, fishermen):*

Hasanuddin (Village government delegation)  
Santana (Fishermen's association)  
Hayun (Village head - Tejang)  
M Hanafi (Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat)  
Marzuki (Fishermen's association)  
Amir (head – coral conservation group 'Karang Taruna')  
Abdul Hamid (director - Remaja Islam mosque)  
Fahrurozi (Karang Taruna)  
M Safei (Fishermen's association)  
Yaya M (Fishermen's association)  
Santani (Karang Taruna)  
Erik (Karang Taruna)  
M Syahrin (Karang Taruna)  
Andi (Karang Taruna)  
Wawan (Karang Taruna)  
Heri (Karang Taruna)

#### *Members of the Management Body:*

Ahyar Abu (Kepala BPDPL- PS)  
Jasiman (Sekretaris BPDPL-PS)  
Herman S (Seksi Monitoring)  
Mahpud (Seksi Monitoring)  
Nur Halim (Seksi Perencanaan)  
Halimi (Seksi Perencanaan)  
Dedi (Seksi Monitoring)  
Syaiful Didi (Seksi Monitoring)

### **The workshop process and results**

#### *Started 8:30am, Sunday morning*

Ahyar Abu (head of the management body) opened the workshop and welcomed participants with a quick introduction, prayer and thanks. Nancy (evaluation coordinator) explained some of her background, the background of the evaluation program and the importance of this workshop in shaping the overall evaluation and usefulness of the results.

A Yani went through the agenda and rules for the workshop:

Workshop agenda:

- Discussion I – adaptive management and the role of evaluation in improving management practice;
- Discussion II – stakeholders, target audience and objectives of the evaluation;
- Discussion III – components of an evaluation and the importance of ‘indicators’;
- Discussion IV – specific indicators of effectiveness for SIMS.

#### **Target results from the workshop:**

- **The participants will understand better the adaptive management process and the role of evaluation in that process.**
- **There will be an agreement on a target audience for the evaluation report.**
- **There will be clear and agreed objectives for the evaluation of SIMS.**
- **There will be a draft list of indicators that suits those objectives.**
- **That draft list of indicators will be prioritised and rated according to how useful and feasible the participants think each of them will be.**

A Yani also reviewed the phases of the overall evaluation program, explained some of the main steps in the program, and highlighted the role and importance that this workshop plays in the evaluation process. After his explanation, there were a two questions about new vocabulary words - “adaptive” and “indicator”. A Yani explained that these were two very important concepts that would be thoroughly discussed during the workshop. There were no other questions about the rules, agenda or goals of the workshop.

#### *09:00 – 11:00*

Indra presented the adaptive learning cycle, explained its relevance to the adaptive management cycle, and discussed the function of monitoring and evaluation in adaptation. He explained each of the terms and steps in the cycle. Participants asked if this was meant to be the cycle for management at SIMS, or for planning, or for what? Nancy explained the general application of such adaptive learning cycles and gave one example of a very quick cycle recently – the planning, implementation, monitoring, reflection and reconceptualisation regarding the first hour of the workshop. Indra then explained the two activities that the participants would be doing in small groups.

The participants were divided into three groups and given five small pieces of paper that told a story of adaptive learning. On each piece was written one step in the adaptive learning process. Each group’s task was to put the pieces in order and paste them to a large diagram of the cycle, then explain their results to the other participants. The samples included situations about hiking to a mountain and contracting malaria, going to Canti on a boat and running out of fuel, and developing appropriate regulations for the sanctuary. The groups struggled to start but after some quick guidance and advice about how to tackle the task, they proceeded well. None of the groups got the presentations right the first time. The other participants helped to correct mistakes and each presentation was a good learning experience.

After presenting their results, each group went back to work on developing their own example of an adaptive learning cycle. With a better understanding derived from the first trial, this second exercise went very quickly. The groups examples of adaptive learning included: experience fishing with a ‘bubu’ trap; another kind of fishing trip; and courtship with a local girl. The latter earned the name ‘love group’ and their sample served as one of the best examples of adaptive learning because it demonstrated that even with good initial results the process of monitoring, evaluation and adapting plans still continues.

Indra then highlighted the **role of monitoring and evaluation** in some examples of adaptive management. He allowed the small groups to set the pace of the learning

process and all the participants appeared to be very comfortable with the adaptive learning cycle, its relevance to adaptive management and the significance, or potential, of evaluation by the time we broke for coffee at 10:45.

### *11:00 – 12:30*

Hero gave a presentation on the various purposes of evaluating effectiveness of management. The three main points from this presentation were:

- there are many reasons or objectives for evaluating effectiveness.
- Each stakeholder has their own perspective on the primary purpose for evaluating.
- One single evaluation is not likely to satisfy the information needs of all stakeholders.
- Objectives for an evaluation of SIMS must consider the information needs of stakeholders who will need and use the information the most.

Hero facilitated a discussion of all the stakeholders who have an active role or interest in the sanctuary, its management and the eventual results of an evaluation. He generated a list of stakeholders (approximately 15 groups, institutions and individuals) based on this discussion. He then asked them to think about prioritising the information needs of these stakeholders in order to identify a target audience for the evaluation report. The subsequent discussion revealed some significant conflicts amongst participants regarding the respective responsibilities of the management body, local government and local communities in managing the sanctuary and developments. Participants were not able to rank their short-list of four stakeholders – management body, community, local government, and NOAA). After considerable discussion about leadership, socialisation, responsibilities and awareness issues, Nancy interrupted with a suggestion for a purely democratic method of ranking the list (each participant got two votes, all votes for each stakeholder were tallied) resulting in the following **composition of the target audience:**

- 1. First priority: information needs of management body and local community;**
- 2. Second priority: information needs of local government and NOAA.**

### *12:30 – 13:15 Lunch, prayer and rest*

### *13:15 – 15:10*

Hero continued with a discussion about objectives for an evaluation. First, he went over a set of criteria for good objectives (specific, appropriate, realistic, time-bound and measurable) and explained a few examples. Then he asked each of the participants to write a few objectives for the SIMS evaluation. The following key words and concepts were taken out of the collection as they were read aloud to the group:

- monitor condition of corals;
- involve or improve participation of the local community;
- broad-scale dissemination of information;
- need to improve local awareness levels regarding environmental, tourism and development issues;
- funding issues.

In order to develop a clear set of objectives, participants were separated into five groups, each assigned to discuss one of the key concepts and draft one related objective that would serve the target audience and satisfy all the criteria (for good objectives) that Hero had explained. This was a difficult task. Initial results from the small groups were as follows:

- 1) Find out about coral reefs
  - a) to monitor their condition, and
  - b) to help develop appropriate strategies and activities.

- 2) Find out about participation of local villagers
  - a) in enforcement of regulations that were discussed and agreed,
  - b) cooperation with management body in surveillance of SIMS,
  - c) sense of ownership of SIMS.
- 3) Distribute information
  - a) inform communities outside Sebesi Island about the SIMS,
  - b) inform local communities and management about changes in the condition of corals.
- 4) Collect information about environmental conditions and management processes, prepare reports and materials for improving local awareness in the upcoming year.
- 5) Collect information about operational funding for SIMS since after Proyek Pesisir was completed until now.

During analysis and reflection on the workshop by the evaluation team, these objectives were refined to a list that the team felt could be used as a clearer guide to the evaluation process. The **revised list of objectives** is as follows:

- 1) Collect information on all aspects of management (contextual issues, planning, inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes) since the completion of Proyek Pesisir (Des 2002) until early 2004.**
- 2) Investigate changes in condition of the coral ecosystem up until present in order to assist in locating appropriate sites and developing appropriate systems for coral rehabilitation.**
- 3) Improve the transparency and clarify the responsibilities of participants in the management of SIMS.**
- 4) Report on conditions of management and natural resources in order to help attract assistance from investors and donors.**

*15:10 – 16:00*

Participants took a short break to refresh and play “If ..., then ...”. Then Nofive introduced the main components of a comprehensive evaluation and explained each one with examples and referrals to the adaptive management cycle. She used the popular and practical example from one of the earlier small groups about courtship to get them thinking about indicators of success and the range of information that is needed to help in planning, making better decisions toward achieving objectives and allocating resources. She also explained the results from interview question #7 on focal questions for an evaluation and discussed some of the implications of the results. There were no questions on her presentation.

*16:00 – 16:50*

Participants were divided into six small working groups and each was assigned one of the following focal questions (components) of evaluation, then they were asked to make a list of all the different kinds of information that would be needed to answer the question:

- (context) What is the current status of the values, threats and management issues in the sanctuary?
- (planning) How adequate are current plans and policies for managing the sanctuary?
- (input) How adequate are the currently available resources for managing the sanctuary?
- (processes) How appropriate are current management systems and procedures?
- (outputs) What kinds of products and services has management delivered and how much of the management plan has been implemented?
- (outcomes) How have the values and threats in the sanctuary changed and which objectives have been achieved by management?

Members of the evaluation team circulated amongst the groups to help them get started and generate comprehensive lists. The group working on the first question about context had the most difficulties getting started and their list needed considerable development by the evaluation team post-workshop. Generally the lists were very short and simple. They were each posted at the front of the workshop area.

A Yani and Nancy introduced the scale for prioritising and guided the participants through the process of rating each indicator on the lists according to how 'useful' and 'feasible' the participants thought each of the indicators would be. The **initial list of indicators and ratings are presented in Table 1** below.

A Yani reviewed the initial list of target results from the workshop and all participants agreed they had achieved what we set out to achieve for the day.

Nancy and Ahyar closed the workshop with thanks and a prayer. General responses on the day were very positive. The workshop ended at 17:00

## **Final Results**

By the end of the day we had achieved all of our key objectives. Participants had a better understanding of methods for evaluating management effectiveness. They had chosen a target audience for the evaluation results and developed a draft list of objectives for the evaluation. They had made a draft list of indicators for an evaluation of management effectiveness of SIMS and rated the usefulness and feasibility of each of the indicators on that list. Participants indicated that terms and concepts that were new at the beginning of the workshop became clear and familiar as the day proceeded. They also commented that the day was extremely useful and they looked forward to the next phase of the program. Additionally, the evaluation team members had gained valuable experience in planning, preparing and implementing the workshop.

The products of the workshop and the results from interviews on information requirements will be used to develop a data collection strategy for the evaluation of SIMS and a draft outline for the evaluation report. This draft outline will also be circulated to stakeholders for comments and suggestions. If you have comments or questions about this summary or about the workshop in December, please contact Nancy Dahl-Tacconi (0812 110 3521) or Nofive (0813 1027 8566).

**Table 1.** List of indicators and ratings (1 = extremely...!; 2 = very...; 3 = somewhat ...; 4 = not very ...; 5 = not ...!

KATEGORI / indikator	USEFUL	FEASIBLE
<b>CONTEXTUAL ISSUES</b>		
status of legal support for the sanctuary	2	4
operations and policies of water police	2	4
facilities for surveillance and enforcement	2	4
current methods for illegal fishing	?	?
land tenure and ownership near the sanctuary	4	5
general condition of local communities	?	?
general condition of marine environment	?	?
<b>PLANNING</b>		
existence of a plan of management?	1	1
clarity of management objectives	1	2
are management objectives in line with local community aspirations?	1	3
time-span of the plan	2	2
extent of socialization related to the plan	1	4
<b>INPUT</b>		
management infrastructure	2	2
work programs assigned to each section	2	3
type and number of working materials ('means')	1	1
type and amount of infrastructure for management	3	4
funds available	?	?
donors (existing and potential)	2	5
local community donations	3	4
government approval and financial support	1	5

KATEGORI / indikator	USEFUL	FEASIBLE
<b>PROCESSES</b>		
transparency regarding financial matters	2	4
explanation of tasks for each section (of the management body)	1	3
supervision/surveillance of SIMS	1	3
maintenance of equipment and facilities	3	4
<b>OUTPUTS</b>		
number of patrol members	2	3
type of activities of patrols	1	4
training for patrols	1	4
schedule for patrol activities	1	4
number of patrol boats	3	3
promotional materials	2	3
number of meeting attendees	1	1
number of meetings	1	1
information that has been distributed	1	1
objectives (??)	1	1
<b>OUTCOMES</b>		
condition of corals (improving or declining)	1	3
improvements in abundance of fish?	1	2
pollution from outside	1	3
cleanliness of beaches	1	3
economic conditions of fishers (amount of catch)	1	2
types of alternative livelihoods available	1	2
local awareness levels about environmental issues	1	3
local knowledge of coral ecosystem	1	3
changes in tourism industry (number of visitors, investment, development, etc)	1	2
changes in fishing methods	1	2