

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Template 2 - formatted for the [UNDP Jobs website](#)

This is an adjusted standard terms of reference for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF/LDCF/SCCF-financed projects taking into account the impact of COVID-19 on evaluations, including consideration for COVID-19 situation assessment within countries, impact and restrictions on evaluations, alternative approaches, methodologies and considerations to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on evaluations.

Underlying this guidance is a principle of "do no harm", and a consideration that the safety of staff, consultants, stakeholders and communities is paramount and the primary concern of all when planning and implementing evaluations during the COVID-19 crisis.

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Home Based and Jakarta

Application Deadline: 22 January 2021

Category: International Consultant

Type of Contract: IC

Assignment Type: TE International Consultant

Languages Required: English

Starting Date: As soon as possible

Duration of Initial Contract: 25 working days

Expected Duration of Assignment: February – April 2021 (25 days)

BACKGROUND

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing Incentive Mechanism for Sustainable Watershed/ Land Management (PIMS # 5224.) implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as the Implementing Partner. The project started on the 31 August 2016 and is in its last (5th) year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document '[Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects](#)'.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Indonesia have ratified the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 26 November 1994, and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought on 31 August 1998. In addition to these conventions, Indonesia also ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 3 December 2004, thereby committing itself to stabilizing global greenhouse gas emissions for the period of 2008-2012. Moreover, to protect biodiversity from the potential risks posed by genetically modified organisms that are the product of biotechnology, Indonesia subscribed to the Cartagena Protocol on Biological Safety on 3 December 2004.

Furthermore, in addition to the three Rio Conventions, Indonesia has also demonstrated its commitment to the global environment through the accession or ratification of several other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) that call for the protection and sustainable use of natural resources.

CCCD Project will strengthen a targeted set of policy, legislative, and economic instruments as stronger incentive mechanisms for mainstreaming global environmental obligations. Specifically, the project will do so through the integration of global environmental values and principles within planning frameworks for integrated water resource management (sustainable watershed management). With this focus, the project will strengthen targeted foundational capacities (systemic, institutional, and individual) to reduce pressure on natural resources through competing land uses, identify and test innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable forest management targeted to protecting watersheds, as well as to mainstream synergies and best practices for monitoring impacts and assessing ecosystem services.

This project fits with the GEF-5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Strategy, specifically to provide resources for reducing, if not eliminating, the institutional bottlenecks and barriers to the synergistic implementation of the Rio Conventions. This particular project is in line with CCCD Programme Frameworks 2, 4, and 5, which call for countries to: (i) generate, access, and use information and knowledge; (ii) strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines; and (iii) enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends, respectively.

The core strategy for CCCD projects utilizes a learning-by-doing approach to engage national stakeholders and encourage ownership of key cross-cutting issues facing the country in order to develop and implement feasible and replicable solutions. In addition to coordinating efforts with other government institutions, CCCD projects also strive to create linkages with other initiatives from national and international development partners. Inherent in this strategy is the effort to institutionalize capacities, to the extent possible, thereby reducing the loss of lessons learned and good practices that are available for improved decision-making and planning.

This project is primarily aligned with GEF-5 Land Degradation Objective 3, which is to reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape. Secondly, the project will also contribute to meeting GEF-5 Land Degradation Objective 4, which is to increase capacity to apply adaptive management tools in sustainable land management.

The total allocated resources (UNDP Managed fund) are US \$ 1,930,000 consisting of TRAC funds (US \$ 50,000) and GEF (US \$ 1,880,000). In addition, in-kind Parallel Funding is US \$ 5,550,000 consisting of Government of Indonesia funds (US \$ 5,500,000) and UNDP (US \$ 50,000). Ministry of Environment and Forestry is leading project implementation with the support of UNDP to strengthen government efforts in implementing Rio Conventions.

Regarding covid-19 outbreak, as of 30 September 2020, there were 287,008 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Indonesia, of which 10,740 were fatalities and 214,947 persons recovered. Covid-19 has been spread in 34 provinces and 487 regencies/cities across Indonesia. Some regions implemented large social restrictions to prevent of Covid-19 pandemics. Covid-19 pandemics have affected the implementation of the project. Based on our assessment, some works can continue on-schedule, some work remains the same but involves delays, some works need to redesign to achieve the expected output.

The activities supported by CCCD project has provided equally important opportunities for the women and men in developing and managing the ecotourism related activities. The CCCD project has provided equal opportunities for women in managing the activities supported by seed grants. The CCCD project has promoted women roles for instance, through the development and management of home industry in producing variety of non-timber forest products, producing merchandise (such as printed shirts, hats, pins), and in adapting with the covid-19 pandemic by promoting health protocol for the local community (such as making cloth mask, maintaining facilities to wash hand properly with water and soap, producing health supplements made of local herbs etc.).

Referring to the Covid-19 outbreak in Indonesia, the impact on the CCCD project implementation include the following:

- (a) The project has to pay attention to the Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia (Keppres RI no. 12/2020 dated 13 April 2020) concerning Determination of Covid-19 Outbreak as Non-natural Disaster, and Large-Scale Social Distancing measures in several provinces, cities and regencies in Indonesia, including the areas where CCCD Project activities are implemented;
- (b) During the past few months, consultations with stakeholders have not been able to take place at the project sites in Lampung and Malang. Since early March 2020 several CCCD activities for Q1 (January to March 2020) particularly the ones related to travels (to project sites), face-to-face discussions or meetings, and personnel mobilizations for field technical activities have been postponed or have not been implemented;
- (c) Many CCCD Project activities in the work plan, including monitoring, facilitation, survey, that involved discussion with group of people, have been delayed in accordance with government regulation;
- (d) To assure personnel safety and community health, the project facilitated measures in the fields by allocating project budget for the procurement of personal protective equipment, such as vitamins, mask and other relevant equipment for the community affected by Covid-19 outbreak.
- (e) To cope with the Covid-19 situation, in the last few months, the project has been working through online system (virtual meetings) to conduct coordination discussions with field coordination units, UNDP Indonesia, the Implementing Partner and other relevant partners.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE process must follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key participants including the Commissioning Unit (the UNDP Country Office), RTAs, Regional M&E Advisors, Country Office M&E Focal Points and Programme Officers, Government counterparts including the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP), the Nature, Climate and Energy Vertical Fund Directorate, and other key stakeholders. Ideally, the TE should occur during the last few months of project activities, allowing the TE team to proceed while the Project Team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability.

At the Project Board Meeting on 4th of December 2020, it was informed that the project team has been constrained working in the field with the project implementation because of COVID-19 pandemic since March 2020. Hence, most of the activities planned for Q2 of the year 2020 were moved to Q3, and a project extension for additional ten months with no cost extension approach was proposed. In Q3, some activities in the field were implemented with a small group by practising physical distancing, and some activities that were supposed to be attended by participants from various places were adjusted through virtual options.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field assessment begins.

The evaluation will mainly focus on assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, impact, coordination and sustainability of CCCD project efforts and will be applied to all three components of the project. The following are guiding questions within the framework of the evaluation criteria (to be reviewed/ elaborated in the evaluation inception report).

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project beneficiaries, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions, however, the TE mission for the international consultant may not be possible due to the Covid-19 situation in Indonesia. For this, virtual tools will be used to conduct the interviews.

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

Due to ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Terminal Evaluation might be conducted using questionnaires, and virtual interviews, but the evaluation team should be able to revise the approach in consultation with the evaluation manager and the key stakeholders. These changes in approach should be agreed and reflected clearly in the TE Inception Report. The national expert consultant will have to play an important role in the conduct of the evaluation and will therefore, perform additional responsibilities. The main responsibilities of the national expert which will be further elaborated in the inception report is attached as **Annex I**.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since March 2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects. The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below.

A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Safeguards
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements

- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown in the TOR Annex F.

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The TE *consultant/team* shall prepare and submit:

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: Approximate due date <i>08 February 2021</i>	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: Approximate due date <i>02 March 2021</i>	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report <i>(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)</i> with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: Approximate due date <i>23 March 2021</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by BPPS-GEF RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report <i>(See template in ToR Annex H)</i>	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: Approximate due date <i>20 April 2021</i>	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*The final TE report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.¹

7. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP CO Indonesia.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

8. DURATION OF THE WORK

¹ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

Note: UNDP evaluation report template is stipulated in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019 - Annex 3 UNDP evaluation report template and quality standards. The Quality Assurance requirements is stipulated in the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines 2019 - Section 6.10.2 on Evaluation report structure, methodology and data sources; Section 6.10.3 on Cross-cutting issues; and Section 6.10.4 on Evaluation results.

The total duration of the TE will be approximately **25 working days** over a time period of **12 weeks** starting on 2nd **February 2021**. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
22 January 2021	Application closes
01 February 2021	Selection of TE team
02 February 2021	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
04 February 2021, 03 days (Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
08 February 2021, 01 day	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
09 – 24 February 2021, 12 days	TE virtual assessment: virtual stakeholders interviews.
02 March 2021	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
23 March 2021, 07 days (Preparation of draft TE report
23 March 2021	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
20 April 2021; 02 days	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
20 May 2021	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
21 May 2021	Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)
22 May 2021	Expected date of full TE completion

COVID-19 travel restriction permissible, options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

The expected date start date of contract is 2nd **February 2021**

9. DUTY STATION

Travel:

- International travel will not be possible for the team leader given the current situation with the COVID-19 pandemic and travel restriction imposed by number of countries in the region and globally;
- In case of travel, the BSAFE course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel;
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under: <https://dss.un.org/dssweb/>
- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents.

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions) and one team expert, usually from the country of the project. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations,

capacity building, develop communication with stakeholders who will be interviewed, and work with the Project Team in developing the TE workplan.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

Due to the ongoing COVID19 pandemic travel restrictions, the International Consultant will work with a National Consultant and the International Consultant will operate remotely using tools to conduct virtual interviews and consultations. Please refer to **Annex I** for the main responsibilities/contribution of the national expert to the evaluation.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

International Consultant

Education

Master's degree in environmental management, sustainable development, social sciences and or other closely related fields (20%)

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
- Experience managing geographic research (human geography, regional development and watershed management); (10%)
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Multi focal area of Cross-Cutting Capacity Development in 3 Rio Conventions; (10%)
- Experience in evaluating projects; (20%)
- Experience working in developing countries in Asia; (5%)
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years; (15%)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Multi focal area of Cross-Cutting Capacity Development in 3 Rio Conventions, sustainable development and/or biodiversity, experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis; (10%)
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (10%)
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

11. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure

compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

12. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

APPLICATION PROCESS²

13. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:

- Financial proposals must be “all inclusive” and expressed in a lump-sum for the total duration of the contract. The term “all inclusive” implies all cost (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances etc.);
- The lump sum is fixed regardless of changes in the cost components.

14. Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template³](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form⁴](#)); Including experiences that mentioned in the Required Skills and Experiences

² Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP
<https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

³<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

- c) Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment, including approach of issues related to gender and Multi focal area of Cross-Cutting Capacity Development in 3 Rio Conventions, sustainable development and/or biodiversity; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation" or by email at the following address ONLY: bids.id@undp.org **by 23:59 PM GMT +7 on 22 January 2021**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

15. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

16. TOR ANNEXES

- a) Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- b) Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- c) Annex C: Content of the TE report
- d) Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- e) Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- f) Annex F: TE Rating Scales and TE Ratings Table
- g) Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- h) Annex H: TE Audit Trail Template
- i) Annex I: Main Responsibilities/Contributions to the Evaluation of the National Consultant

Results Framework

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
A set of important capacities for Indonesia to make better SLM/SWM decisions to meet and sustain global obligations				
Policy, and for national of convention and capacities needed for to and Rio within development and in the between Rio and sustainable	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Requirements of the Rio Conventions are not adequately incorporated in sectoral development planning2. There is little inter-ministerial coordination on the implementation of natural resource and environmental policies3. Indonesia has adopted a number of key policies and programmes to govern key aspects of environmental and natural resource management, but	By the end of the project: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Rio Convention obligations are being better implemented through improved policies, capacities, and awareness2. There is an increase in coordination between government groups and other stakeholders and SLM/SWM is strengthened through improved mandates, capacities, and models3. There is an increase in the appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the general public	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Updated watershed management plan at selected project sites⁵2. Rio Convention national reports and communications3. Working Group meeting reports4. Independent project evaluation reports5. GEF Cross-Cutting Capacity Development Scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Internal resistance to change▪ Lack of leadership and ownership▪ Lack of a policy or legislation to facilitate national consensus of key data and information▪ Project benefits stakeholders unequally▪ Lack of sustainability/replicability of outcomes▪ Limited coordination▪ The project will be executed in a transparent,

Meetings such as local, regional and national consultations regarding inputs on the design and implementation of the relevant output
individual or group meetings, with government officials or non-state stakeholders.

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	the interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of policy, legislation, and regulation remains weak			<p>holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government staff and non-state stakeholder representatives are actively engaged in the project Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible and approved by the Project Board
Legislative, and economic instruments				
of the policy and work of the and needs of stakeholders and a role for Rio	1.1.1 Indonesia has adopted a number of key policies and programmes to govern key aspects of environmental and natural resource management, but the	<p>1.1.1 Current policy and legal framework are assessed</p> <p>1.1.1.1 The three (3) in-depth thematic analyses (CBD, CCD, and FCCC) of Indonesia's environmental governance are drafted by month 6</p> <p>1.1.1.2 The analytical report</p>	<p>1. The three in-depth thematic analyses</p> <p>2. Synthesis report</p> <p>3. Policy recommendation</p> <p>4. Meeting/workshops minutes</p> <p>5. Approval letters</p>	<p>1. Institutions and working groups are open to change</p> <p>2. Members of the technical committees will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions</p> <p>3. Analyses are</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
ion and nd any policy, or	interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of policy, legislation, and regulation remains weak 1.1.2 Institutional structures are in need of clearly defined mandates and operational plans 1.1.3 Indonesia's legislation suffers from numerous issues including overlapping and contradictory provisions, and laws that contain sectoral or corporate interests that contradict government policy	that synthesizes all three Rio Conventions is drafted and endorsed by month 8 1.1.1.3 Expert working groups draft policy recommendations by month 8 1.1.2 Assessment report is drafted and peer reviewed by month 5, endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop by month 7, and finalized and subsequently approved by Project Board finalized by month 8 1.1.3 Appropriate guidelines are formulated and approved or regulatory instrument amended 1.1.3.1 Legislative and regulatory instruments are drafted by month 24 1.1.3.2 Operational guidelines drafted by month 15, peer reviewed by independent experts by month 17, finalized by month 19, and		deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions 4. The approval process is transparent and deemed valid by all stakeholders 5. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews 6. Limited numbers of experts in the field who might be available to undertake the specific task

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>validated by month 21 through stakeholder workshop</p> <p>1.1.3.3 Policy recommendations to legitimize these guidelines, as appropriate, are prepared, submitted, approved by the Project Board by month 24</p>		
Study on economic resource efficiency	<p>1.2.1 The government agencies responsible for the Rio Conventions have limited budgetary funds</p> <p>1.2.2 There is a lack of financial resources available for environmental monitoring, processing and exchange, and an inefficient use of limited resources</p>	<p>1.2.1 Feasibility study on financial and economic instruments are undertaken</p> <p>1.2.1.1 Expert working group is made up of at least 20 rotating members and will be established by month 7</p> <p>1.2.1.2 Convene expert working group to review recommendations of institutional reforms. Expert working group presents a consensus agreement on prioritized recommendations by month 12.</p> <p>1.2.1.3 Undertake an analysis</p>	<p>1. Meeting minutes</p> <p>2. Tracking and progress reports</p> <p>3. Needs discussion report</p> <p>4. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</p>	<p>1. Institutions and working groups are open to change</p> <p>2. Members of the working groups will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions</p> <p>3. Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions</p> <p>4. The approval process is transparent and</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>of the economic instruments at the national and provincial levels to identify challenges and barriers to Rio Convention implementation from an Indonesian context, drafted by month 7, peer reviewed by month 9, and completed by month 11</p> <p>1.2.1.4 Convene a working group of relevant experts and conduct stakeholder meetings to discuss findings of the analysis of economic instruments.</p> <p>1.2.1.5 The drafting of a feasibility study on financial and economic instruments to advance the CCCD/SLM/SWM by month 13, with the first draft available by month 15. It is endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop by month 16, finalized</p>		<p>deemed valid by all stakeholders</p> <p>5. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</p> <p>6. Limited numbers of experts in the field who might be available to undertake the specific task</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>and approved by Project Board by month 18</p> <p>1.2.2 Resource mobilization strategy is drafted and approved</p> <p>1.2.2.1 Resource Mobilization strategy is drafted by experts by month 21</p> <p>1.2.2.2 Expert working group reviews and guides the revision and finalization of the resource mobilization strategy by month 25, after which it is presented to a donors' round-table by month 27</p> <p>1.2.2.3 Resource mobilization strategy approved by Project Board and proposed to Rio Convention focal points by month 28</p>		
analytical	1.3 Indonesia is undertaking numerous efforts to increase SLM,	<p>1.3.1 Analytical framework is developed</p> <p>1.3.1.1 Analytical</p>	1. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews	<p>1. Institutions and working groups are open to change</p> <p>2. Members of the</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	but it is not currently mainstreamed into national and sectoral policies	<p>framework is drafted <u>by month 5</u> and peer reviewed <u>by month 7</u></p> <p>1.3.1.2 The in-depth thematic reviews of Indonesia's existing national development strategies (strategic plan of relevant Ministries/Agencies) and Rio Convention action plans are completed by month 12</p> <p>1.3.1.3 Expert Working Groups (WG) are established and agreed Project Board by month 5; WG will review and discuss the findings of the analyses of systemic and institutional capacities as well as the institutional assessments by month 6</p> <p>1.3.2 SWM model(s) are conceptualized and developed</p>	<p>2. Thematic reviews</p> <p>3. Meeting minutes</p> <p>4. Knowledge management model</p> <p>5. SWM models</p> <p>6. Roadmap</p>	<p>working groups will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions</p> <p>3. Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions</p> <p>4. Limited numbers of experts in the field who might be available to undertake the specific task</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>1.3.2.1. SWM models for mainstreaming Rio Conventions are formulated through learning-by-doing workshops by month 20. Models are independently peer reviewed and finalized by month 24</p> <p>1.3.2.2. Undertake a targeted study of best policy tools for linkages among SLM, SWM, Rio Convention National Action Plans, and development policies/strategies, drafted by month 20</p> <p>1.3.3 Roadmap is to be drafted by month 16, independently peer reviewed by month 18, and finalized by month 20. The roadmap is approved by the Project Board by month 24</p> <hr/>		

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Improved institutional mechanism for sharing comparative advantages and know-how among partner agencies and for	1.4 There is limited institutional coordination and collaboration that would foster the sharing of comparative advantages and know-how	<p>1.4.1 Institutional mechanism for consultative and decision making process are improved and approved</p> <p>1.4.1.1 Review existing institutional framework on coordination mechanism for implementation of Rio Convention</p> <p>1.4.1.2 Needs report drafted by month 6, endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop by month 8, and finalized and subsequently approved by Project Board by month 10</p> <p>1.4.1.3 Learning-by-doing workshops formulate a new or improved best practical consultative and decision-making institutional mechanism by month 12</p> <p>1.4.1.4 New or improved consultative and</p>	<p>1. Needs Assessment report</p> <p>2. Liaison protocols among partner agencies</p>	<p>1. Internal resistance to change</p> <p>2. Lack of leadership and ownership</p> <p>3. Members of the working groups will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>decision-making institutional mechanism is approved by Project Board by month 15</p> <p>1.4.2 Liaison protocols among partner agencies are drafted and approved</p> <p>1.4.2.1 Liaison protocols among partner agencies drafted are drafted by month 10, validated in a stakeholder workshop by month 12, approved by the Project Board by month 13</p> <p>1.4.3 Strengthen fora on SLM and mainstreaming SLM into regional and national policy programmes by month 9. These fora should meet at least twice a year on priority issues.</p>		
Additional and individual capacities to mainstream SLM/SWM				
SLM pilot on broad	2.1 Indonesia has undertaken	2.1.1 Stakeholder consultations result in the final selection	1. Meeting minutes	1. Assessment is deemed

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Study to be	several initiatives to increase SWM, but these efforts have not been mainstreamed	<p>of maximum three priority watersheds in which to carry out project activities by month 6, approved by project board in month 7</p> <p>2.1.2 Feasibility study and activities to be piloted is completed by month 12. This will include review of existing watershed management plan at project site(s). This activity should be initiated by developing watershed-map with scale of 1:50,000. This study also contains procedures for accessing best practice guidance and methodologies, and the collaborative approach to planning and Rio Convention mainstreaming.</p>	<p>2. Approval letters</p> <p>3. Feasibility study report</p>	<p>legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions</p> <p>2. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</p>
with led to	2.2.1 There is overlap between institutions and limited coordination	<p>2.2.1 Institutional arrangement revisions is recommended within a report</p> <p>2.2.1.1 Convene workshops by month 16</p>	<p>1. Meeting minutes</p> <p>2. Recommendations for revisions to institutional arrangements</p>	<p>1. Recommendations are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Exercises for project Lessons learned prepared SWM	between stakeholders	<p>2.2.1.2 Report with recommended revisions to institutional arrangements completed by month 18</p> <p>2.2.2 Selected exercises are piloted at project sites</p> <p>2.2.2.1 Selected exercises piloted at maximum three watersheds and completed by month 40.</p> <p>2.2.2.2 Women's participation is accommodated</p> <p>2.2.3 Lessons learned report prepared on CCCD/SLM/SWM activities completed by month 43 and presented to stakeholder workshops by month 44</p>	<p>3. Workshop materials</p> <p>4. Demonstrations plot established</p> <p>5. Lessons learned report</p>	<p>representatives and project champions</p> <p>2. The various government authorities maintain commitment to the project and are open to change</p>
Needs report Dissemination	2.3.1 The full set of necessary skills may not be available in Indonesia; Individuals responsible for developing development	<p>2.3.1 Needs report drafted by month 7, endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop by month 9, finalized and subsequently approved by Project Board by month 10</p> <p>2.3.2 Training modules drafted,</p>	<p>1. Meeting minutes</p> <p>2. Needs report</p> <p>3. Training programme</p> <p>4. Peer reviewer comments</p> <p>5. Project end</p>	<p>1. Report and guidelines are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<p>modules reviewed, and training institution</p>	<p>plans possess weak technical capacities and skills</p> <p>2.3.2 Weak institutional coordination and collaboration to foster the sharing of comparative advantages and know-how</p> <p>2.3.3 There are trainings directed to specific technical skills, but they do not include mainstreaming of Rio Convention and SLM/SWM</p>	<p>reviewed and finalized</p> <p>2.3.2.1 Comprehensive training programme drafted by month 16, endorsed by the expert working groups by month 17, and approved by the Project Board by month 19</p> <p>2.3.2.2 Training programme is revised and strengthened on lessons learned by month 45</p> <p>2.3.2.3 Draft guidelines prepared by month 12, revised through learning-by-doing workshop by month 15, independently peer reviewed by month 17, and finalized and approved by Project Board month 19</p> <p>2.3.3 Training programme implemented in accordance to the training plan commenced at month 12</p>	<p>awareness report</p> <p>6. Guidelines</p>	<p>champions</p> <p>2. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</p> <p>3. Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values</p> <p>4. Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions' implementation through national environmental legislation over time</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
of and needs frameworks conducted approved of M&E attention	<p>2.4.1 Environmental monitoring in Indonesia is currently characterized as unsatisfactory and insufficient to meet the requirements of the three Rio Conventions</p> <p>2.4.2 Indonesia's environmental monitoring and evaluation system is inadequate</p>	<p>2.4.1 Analysis of monitoring and evaluation needs drafted, independently peer-reviewed, and completed by month 14</p> <p>2.4.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks finalized and approved. Gender balance is indicated by approximately 50% participation of women.</p> <p>2.4.2.1 Draft monitoring and evaluation frameworks developed by month 16</p> <p>2.4.2.2 Expert working group sessions to finalize M&E frameworks by month 18</p> <p>2.4.2.3 Appropriate set of best practicable monitoring and evaluation frameworks finalized by month 21, validated by stakeholders by month 22, and approved by Project Board by</p>	<p>1. Frameworks</p> <p>2. Meeting minutes</p> <p>3. Tracking and progress reports</p> <p>4. Needs reports</p> <p>5. Stakeholder comments</p>	<p>1. Analyses are deemed legitimate, relevant, and valid among all key stakeholder representatives and project champions</p> <p>2. Frameworks developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible</p> <p>3. Lead agencies will allow their staff to attend all workshops</p> <p>4. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>month 24</p> <p>2.4.3 At least 80 government staff members that are directly implicated in the planning and decision-making process to monitor and enforce environmental legislation have participated in M&E workshops between months 18 and 32</p>		
dedicated to institutional job, of and of	<p>2.5.1 Mandates often overlap</p> <p>2.5.2 There is confusion over mandates after the termination of the REDD+ agency and the National Council on Climate Change and the creation of the MoEF</p> <p>2.5.3 Financial sustainability strategy is not available</p>	<p>2.5.1 Report with recommended revisions to institutional mandates drafted by month 20, and validated by stakeholders by month 22, and approved by the Project Board by month 24</p> <p>2.5.1.1 Improved stakeholder's participation through strengthened watershed fora at regional and national level</p> <p>2.5.1.2 Convene</p>	<p>1. Meeting minutes</p> <p>2. Report with recommended revisions</p> <p>3. National Actions Programmes (NAP) on UNCCD</p> <p>4. Financial sustainability strategies</p>	<p>1. Recommendations developed by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible</p> <p>2. Expert peer reviewers follow through with quality reviews</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		<p>workshops on three Rio Conventions and on sustainable watershed management by month 28</p> <p>2.5.2 Recommendations to job descriptions, terms of references, and procedures of relevant government authorities are completed by month 28, revised and validated by stakeholders by month 30, and approved by the Project Board by month 32</p> <p>2.5.3 Financial sustainability strategies are drafted by month 38, independently peer reviewed by month 40, revised and validated by month 42, and approved by the Project Board by month 44</p>		
of global environmental values				
on	3.1.1 The population in rural areas do not have an	3.1.1 Surveys on awareness to targeted stakeholders carried out by month 4 and	<p>1. Communication Strategy and Plan</p> <p>2. Project activity</p>	1. The various government authorities

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
<p>and plan</p> <p>of the</p> <p>the</p> <p>at as</p> <p>the Rio</p> <p>s is</p>	<p>adequate understanding of global environmental issues</p> <p>3.1.2 Despite the fact that many stakeholders are aware of the global environmental issues, they do not use the available information for decision-making or the development of strategic documents</p> <p>3.1.3 At present, there is insufficient understanding of the value that the Rio Conventions can contribute to national socio-economic development by facilitating environmentally</p>	<p>by month 42</p> <p>3.1.1.1 Baseline awareness report prepared by month 7</p> <p>3.1.1.2 Project-end awareness report prepared by month 45</p> <p>3.1.2 Communication strategy and plan developed by month 10</p> <p>3.1.3 Awareness of the value of the environment as well as the Rio Conventions is increased</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Website and relevant social media presence created by month 6 and regularly updated ➤ At least five (5) media journalist visit project sites to promote SLM and SWM practices through media reportage by month 25, 37 and 44. ➤ Number of visits to the webpages relevant to the Rio Convention is increased by at least 10% over the baseline 	<p>report</p> <p>3. Tracking and progress reports</p> <p>4. Social media page</p> <p>5. Project website</p> <p>6. Baseline awareness report</p> <p>7. Lessons learned reports</p>	<p>maintain commitment to the project</p> <p>2. Survey respondents contribute their honest attitudes and values</p> <p>3. Survey results will show an increased awareness and understanding of the Rio Conventions' implementation through national environmental legislation over time</p> <p>4. Changes in awareness and understanding of Rio Convention mainstreaming can be attributed to project activities (survey questionnaire can address this issue)</p> <p>5. Private sector representatives are open to learn about Rio</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
	sound and sustainable development	<p>(prior to month 4 of project initiation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ By month 44, reporting in the popular literature on SLM and SWM as well as monitoring of impact results in the context of the Rio Convention mainstreaming shows a 10% increase over forecasted trends using baseline data and past trends ➤ Lessons learned report prepared on targeted Rio Convention mainstreaming activities completed by month 38, presented to stakeholder workshops by month 40, and widely distributed by month 44 		<p>Convention mainstreaming values and opportunities, and will actively work to support project objectives</p> <p>6. Internal resistance to change</p>
bulletins, on and the ns that the the Rio nd help	3.2.1 There is a limited awareness of linkages between poverty, the environment and social	3.2.1 At least 12 articles on the relevancy of the new and innovative approaches for SLM and SWM will be written and published in popular literature with high circulation, and printed as brochures for	<p>1. Published articles</p> <p>2. Printed and distributed brochures</p>	<p>1. Articles published in the popular media will be read and not skipped over</p> <p>2. Brochures and bulletins will be</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
How their are the ment	<p>unrest</p> <p>3.2.2 There is insufficient understanding of the value that the Rio Conventions can contribute to national socio-economic development by facilitating environmentally sound and sustainable development</p>	<p>distribution at special event. First article is to be published by month 6</p> <p>3.2.2 At least 24 articles and/or bulletins on the relevancy of the Rio Conventions to Indonesia's national socio-economic development will be written and published in popular literature with high circulation and printed as brochures for distribution for special event. First article is to be published by month 6</p>		<p>read and the content absorbed</p>
Service t (PSA) revision that as well ning of ns into c	<p>3.3 The general public in Indonesia remains generally unaware or unconcerned about the contribution of the Rio Conventions to meeting local and national socio-economic priorities</p>	<p>3.3 One PSA completed for radio and television by month 14, with the first airing by month 16; and at least 5 airings of the PSA on television and at least 20 airings of the PSA on radio both by month 44</p>	<p>1. PSAs</p>	<p>1. PSAs will be listened to and not skipped over</p> <p>2. The content of PSAs will be absorbed</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Education module on environmental issues in the watershed and visit and lessons learned report	3.4 In general, students do not have a comprehensive view of environmental issues	<p>3.4.1 Public education module on Rio Convention mainstreaming completed by month 25 and approved by the Project Board by month 26</p> <p>3.4.2 Education module prepared for secondary schools completed by month 25 in both Indonesian and English languages; and at least 10 secondary schools have implemented education module by month 28 and at 20 secondary schools by month 44</p> <p>3.4.3 Sites for tree planting are selected by month 25 and planting begun by month 28</p> <p>3.4.4 Plans for field visits and study tours completed by month 15; and at least two (2) field visits and two (2) study tours are completed by month 20 and at least six (6) by month 44</p> <p>3.4.5 Lessons learned report and guidelines for future</p>	<p>1. Meeting minutes</p> <p>2. Civil servant and secondary schools education modules and accompanying lecture materials</p> <p>3. Trees planted</p> <p>4. Plans for field visits and study tours</p> <p>5. High school and youth field visit and study tour</p> <p>6. Lessons learned report and guidelines</p>	<p>1. Education module will be popular with teachers, students, and their parents</p> <p>2. Education modules will be effective</p> <p>3. Education module will be popular with civil servants</p> <p>4. High school and youth competition plans are popular with teachers, students, and their parents</p>

Key indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Baseline value	Target value and date		
		replication and scaling up prepared by month 42		

: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team

Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
Project Identification Form (PIF)
UNDP Initiation Plan
Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
CEO Endorsement Request
UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
Inception Workshop Report
Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
Oversight mission reports
Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
Audit reports
Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
Sample of project communications materials
Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
List of contracts and procurement items over ~US\$5,000 (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available
UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
Relevant COVID19 Impacts Studies and the National Recovery Strategies

: Content of the TE report

le page

- Title of UNDP-supported GEF-financed project
- UNDP PIMS ID and GEF ID
- TE timeframe and date of final TE report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other project partners
- TE Team members

nowledgements

ble of Contents

ronyms and Abbreviations

ecutive Summary (3-4 pages)

- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Ratings Table
- Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned
- Recommendations summary table

roduction (2-3 pages)

- Purpose and objective of the TE
- Scope
- Methodology
- Data Collection & Analysis
- Ethics
- Limitations to the evaluation
- Structure of the TE report

object Description (3-5 pages)

- Project start and duration, including milestones
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Expected results
- Main stakeholders: summary list
- Theory of Change

ndings

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be given a rating⁶

Project Design/Formulation

- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

⁶ Annex F for rating scales.

1. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- UNDP implementation/oversight (*) and Implementing Partner execution (*), overall project implementation/execution (*), coordination, and operational issues

2. Project Results

- Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (*)
- Relevance (*)
- Effectiveness (*)
- Efficiency (*)
- Overall Outcome (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender
- Other Cross-cutting Issues
- Social and Environmental Standards
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-economic (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), and overall likelihood (*)
- Country Ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting Issues
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to Impact

3. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Main Findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned

4. Annexes

- TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- TE Mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Summary of field visits
- Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Co-financing tables (if not include in body of report)
- TE Rating scales
- Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form

- Signed TE Report Clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* TE Audit Trail
- *Annexed in a separate file:* relevant terminal GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators or Tracking Tools, as applicable

Annex 1: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template

How well articulated is the CCCD project's theory of change?

What specific methods and tools were used to assess the needs of the project beneficiaries? Have the interventions match the capacities needs for the institutions and individuals?

How well does CCCD project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances?

How did UNDP/ CCCD project contribute towards, and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of Indonesia; UNDAF outcomes; and CPD outcomes?

Process & Results

How far to what extent is CCCD project successful in achieving the expected results?

To what extent were target institutions (MoEF primarily) engaged in the implementation of the project?

How effective CCCD project has been in developing institutional capacity especially in preparing policy review and monitoring MoEF in gender responsive budgeting?

To what extent are CCCD project interventions been implemented/ coordinated with appropriate and effective partnership and strategies? What has been the nature and added value of these partnerships?

What results are evident short-term to long term results that can be directly or indirectly attributed to the project?

What factors contribute or influence CCCD project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women's economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights?

To what extent are funding, staff, and other resources used to achieving the expected results of the project?

Based on cost-benefit analysis what conclusions can be drawn regarding 'value for money' and cost related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing CCCD project?

Were there any unanticipated events, opportunities or constraints contributed to or hindered the delivery of the interventions on timely manner?

Have associated risks at the national and local level been anticipated and addressed? Potential Impact

What impact did the CCCD project have on women's economic status in targeted provinces?

What impact did the CCCD project have on women's access to justice in targeted provinces?

What impact did the CCCD project have in the line ministries in improving women's status?

Conclusion

To what extent the project adopted a coordinated and participatory approach in mainstreaming gender into policies and programs?

To what extent the project used UNDP's internal expertise and adopted joint planning and programming with other UNDP projects?

To what extent the project was effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution?

ility

to what extent did the capacity building activities under each of the pillars produce lasting results?

to what extent GEP-II has taken the necessary steps to transfer capacities and skills to MoEF and other institutional partners?

ow, and to what extent did UNDP/ CCCD project design, implementation strategy/ partnership, and governance foster national ownership and capacity development?

Criteria	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment development priorities at the local, regional and national level?			
<i>evaluative</i>	<i>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. project documentation, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the TE mission, etc.)</i>	<i>(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)</i>
Success: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
Risks: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to long-term project results?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
Please use the table to include questions for all criteria being assessed: Monitoring & Evaluation, UNDP Implementation, Implementing Partner Execution, cross-cutting issues, etc.)			
Please include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.			

: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

ence entails the ability to evaluate without undue influence or pressure by any party (including unit) and providing evaluators with free access to information on the evaluation subject. ence provides legitimacy to and ensures an objective perspective on evaluations. An ent evaluation reduces the potential for conflicts of interest which might arise with self-reported those involved in the management of the project being evaluated. Independence is one of ten principles for evaluations (together with internationally agreed principles, goals and targets: edibility, impartiality, ethics, transparency, human rights and gender equality, national capacities, and professionalism).

Consultants:

present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are ounded.

Disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by valuation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

and protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands e, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must e an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

imes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate gative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues l be reported.

l be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line he UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender ty. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of valuation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the tion and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

sponsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral atation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

l reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently ted.

onfirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated and did not carry out oject's Mid-Term Review.

Consultant Agreement Form

to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

valuator: _____

nsultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

at I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

_____ (Place) on _____ (Date)

TE Rating Scales

Monitoring & Evaluation Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no short comings; quality of M&E design/implementation exceeded expectations
Satisfactory (S)	There were minor shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation met expectations
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were moderate shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation more or less met expectations
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was somewhat lower than expected
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of M&E design/implementation was substantially lower than expected
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in M&E design/implementation
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design/implementation.

Implementation/Oversight and Execution Ratings Scale

Rating	Description
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution exceeded expectations
Satisfactory (S)	There were no or minor shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution met expectations.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution more or less met expectations.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	There were significant shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was somewhat lower than expected
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major shortcomings; quality of implementation/execution was substantially lower than expected
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation/execution
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation and execution

Outcome Ratings Scale - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency

Rating	Description
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no shortcomings
Satisfactory (S)	Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings
Unsatisfactory (U)	Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major shortcomings.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe shortcomings
Unable to Assess (UA)	The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements

Sustainability Ratings Scale

Ratings	Description
Highly Likely (L)	There are little or no risks to sustainability
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainability
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainability
Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainability
Unable to Assess (UA)	Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability

Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

Final Evaluation Report for *(Project Title & UNDP PIMS ID)* Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Lead Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Annex 1: TE Audit Trail

This template is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft TE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final TE report. This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report. This Audit Trail should not be attached to the report file.

Comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of Enhancing the Protected Area System (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation (PIMS ID 4392)

Comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Institution/organization	#	Para comment location	No./ Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

