

Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in [UNDP Jobs website](https://jobs.undp.org/)¹

This is an adjusted standard terms of reference for Mid-Term Reviews 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: Indonesia

Application Deadline:

Type of Contract: Individual Contract

Post Level: International Consultant

Languages Required: English (Knowledge of Bahasa Indonesia would be an asset)

Starting Date: 01 April 2021

Duration of Initial Contract: 40 working days

Expected Duration of Assignment: April 2021 – June 2021

BACKGROUND

A. Project Title

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Midterm Review (MTR) of the **full**-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled **Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan (KALFOR Project)** (PIMS 5029) implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF), which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project started on the 22 December 2017 and is in its **third** year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews during the Covid19 Pandemic of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/office/eo/SitePages/gef-evaluation-guidelines.aspx>).

¹ <https://jobs.undp.org/>

B. Project Description

The project was designed to: maintain forest areas, including the biodiversity and ecosystem functions, of Kalimantan's lowland and montane areas in the face of growth and development of the estate crop sector. The project aims to create significant global benefits related to biodiversity conservation, sustainable land use and mitigation of GHG emission, particularly in the HoB. Systemic and institutional barriers to improved strategic plantations/commodities siting and plantation management will be addressed at the national, provincial and landscape levels, backed by incentives for making any plantation expansion policy compatible with green growth.

The project intervention is focused on three pilot provinces: West Kalimantan (Sintang and Ketapang districts), Central Kalimantan (Kotawaringin Barat district) and East Kalimantan (Kutai Timur district). The project team has identified that there are over 2.36 million ha of currently forested land within forest located outside state owned forest land (Area Penggunaan Lain – APL) and convertible production forest (Hutan Produksi Konversi-HPK) in the three provinces. It estimates that up to 70% of such lands are found within the biologically critical Heart of Borneo area and that 15-20% of these areas are found on ecologically fragile and fire-prone peat soils. Currently, data and information regarding the above-defined land areas have been collected by the Kalfor's team by running four (4) program components:

- i) Component 1: Mainstreaming of forest ecosystem service and biodiversity considerations into national, provincial, and district policies and decision-making processes for forest area planning and management;
- ii) Component 2: Strengthened and expanded implementation of best practices in the estate crops sector in maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem services in four target landscapes in Kalimantan;
- iii) Component 3: Creation of incentives system to safeguard forests, including biodiversity and ecosystem services, from estate crop sector;
- iv) Component 4: Knowledge management and M&E.

Gender mainstreaming strategy is a development strategy that takes into account the different conditions, experiences, aspirations and needs of women and men in development. As a strategy, gender mainstreaming strategy is a systematic effort to address gender disparities, through corrective measures in relation to resource access and control, to realize gender equitable and equitable power relations.

The implementation of the gender mainstreaming strategy in the Kalfor project has started since the project planning stage. This can be seen from the gender analysis and the formulation of a gender strategy in the project in general. In the project proposal document, this can be seen, among others, in the formulation of gender issues in the project and the formulation of a gender action plan to address these gender issues.

The activities supported by Kalfor project has provided equally important opportunities for the women and men in developing and managing the biodiversity conservation, sustainable land use and mitigation of GHG emission related activities. The project has provided equal opportunities for women in managing the activities supported by seed grants/micro grants. The Kalfor 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.).

Regarding covid-19 outbreak, as of 17 January 2021, there were 907,929 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Indonesia, of which 25,987 were fatalities and 736,460 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 seven years Kalfor project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry as the Implementing Partner. The project has a total budget of USD 59,050,000 comprising of a grant from GEF-Supported funding of USD 9,000,000 and the parallel co-finance from the government of USD 50,000,000 and UNDP of USD 50,000. The project document was signed on 22 December 2017 and start to operational in 2018 for 7 years project period.

C. MTR Purpose

As an integral part of the project implementation cycle, UNDP has initiated a project evaluation that will analyze the achievements of the KalFor project against its original objectives while providing project partners with an independent review of project outputs/outcomes. Result of the MTR will be submitted to the GEF. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration.

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy, including gender mainstreaming and approach to the vulnerable group, and its risks to sustainability. The risk of sustainability should include assessment to social and non-social aspects with clear analysis on impacts from mitigation efforts conducted by project so far, if any, and other challenges that might still occur. The MTR will also look at any project interventions that have contributed directly or indirectly to government's effort of COVID-19 recovery both at the national level and project sites.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

D. MTR Approach & Methodology

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

The MTR team will:

- a. 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, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review.

- b. Review the baseline GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.
- c. Review also technical and managerial aspects and consider issues of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability. This review should be conducted through out project's components, strategy and approach against its objectives, output and outcome targets.
- d. Identify factors that have facilitated and/or impeded the achievement of objectives and should result in recommendations and lessons learned that will help project managers in reorienting and re-prioritizing project activities and managerial arrangements as needed for the remainder of the project. The MTR should take into account all relevant factors including social and/or gender factors that may hinder achievement of objectives. Hence, gender lens should be applied in the whole approach and methodology of evaluation review.
- e. Forward looking, giving future directions and recommendations for the project team, donors, government and partners and providing them with a clear understanding of the major outcomes and with a strategy and policy options to achieve the project's expected results more effectively and efficiently.
- f. Provide the basis for learning and accountability for managers and stakeholders.

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders. Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (list of stakeholders can be found in the annexes); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team may require conducting field missions to Jakarta, including the following project sites Kutai Timur, Kotawaringin Barat, Sintang, and Ketapang.

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. Considering the COVID-19 situation, the MTR team should consider flexibility in using technologies and tools to effectively engage stakeholder virtually. The MTR team must 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 MTR report. Whenever is required, the MTR team could conduct separate discussion of men and women to prevent situation of unequal gender power relation hinder the data/information gathering

² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

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

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

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 03/2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR mission then the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. 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 MTR schedule. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit

If all or part of the MTR 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 MTR 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.

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 MTR schedule.

E. Detailed Scope of the MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

1. Project Strategy

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?

- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
 - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

2. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the log frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved" (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ³	Baseline Level ⁴	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ⁵	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ⁶	Achievement Rating ⁷	Justification for
Objective:	Indicator (if applicable):							
Outcome 1:	Indicator 1:							

³ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

⁴ Populate with data from the Project Document

⁵ If available

⁶ Colour code this column only

⁷ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

	Indicator 2:							
Outcome 2:	Indicator 3:							
	Indicator 4:							
	Etc.							
Etc.								

• **Indicator Assessment Key**

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.
- When the project has gender action plan, and is it implemented ?, the MTR should cover its review.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
		TOTAL	59,050,000		

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes each co-financing amount as ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.)

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women’s participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
 - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
 - The identified types of risks⁸ (in the SESP).
 - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP).
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications & Knowledge Management:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

4. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

⁸ Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make recommendations to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table.

The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and Rating Scales.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for (Kalimantan Forest Project)

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement	

	Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- **MTR Inception Report:** MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than **2 weeks** before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: (19 April 2021)
- **Presentation:** MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: (11 May 2021)
- **Draft MTR Report:** MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes **within 3 weeks** of the MTR mission. Completion date: (28 May 2021)
- **Final Report*:** MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit **within 1 week** of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: (18 June 2021)

Midterm Review Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. Date 19 April 2021	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission. Date: 11 May 2021	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final MTR Report	Full report	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Date 28 May 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final MTR Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been	Within 2 weeks of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Date: 18 June 2021	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

		addressed in the final MTR report		
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--

*The final MTR 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.

G. Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Indonesia Country Office.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of the travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team, if the travel is permitted. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

The Commissioning Unit and Project Team will provide logistic support in the implementation of remote/ virtual meetings if travel to project site is restricted. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the MTR team.

If travel is possible, the National Consultant shall conduct a field visit to the pilot project locations among Samarinda, Palangka Raya, Pontianak, Kota Waringin Barat, Sintang, Ketapang, and Kutai Timur.

No	Indicative Location	Frequency	Number of Travel Days
1	Sintang	1	5
2	Ketapang	1	5
3	Kota Waringin Barat	1	5
4	Kutai Timur	1	5

H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately **40 days** over a period of **8 weeks** starting on 01 April 2021, and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired.

The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- **(12 February 2021)**: Application closes
- **(19 March 2021)**: Selection of MTR Team
- **(24 March 2021)**: Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- **(09 April 2021) 4 days** : Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- **(19 April 2021) 7 days**: Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- **(20 April- 10 May 2021) 15 days**: MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits
- **(11 May 2021)**: Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission

- (28 May 2021) 6 days : Preparing draft report
- (18 June 2021) 4 days : Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report (note: accommodate time delay in dates for circulation and review of the draft report)
- (24 June 2021): Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- (25 June 2021): (optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
- (30 June 2021): Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is (01 April 2021).

I. Duty Station

- a) The contractor's duty station will be home-based with possibility of subject to the approval from RR or Head of Unit.
- b) The consultant is working on the output-based, thus no necessity to report or present regularly

Travel:

- International travel may require to Indonesia during the MTR mission, if the travel is permitted;
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: <https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php> . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- 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/>

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

A team of *two independent consultants* will conduct the MTR - *one team leader (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert from Indonesia (National Consultant)*. The team leader will *be responsible for the overall design and writing of the MTR report*. The team expert will *assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary, etc.)*

The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Indonesia. In the case of international travel restriction and the mission is not possible, the MTR team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant's guidance.

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

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

Education

A master's degree or higher in forestry, natural sciences, environmental studies, social development, public policy, and/ or related fields. (15%)

Experience

- Experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies and applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (15%);
- Minimum 8 years of experience in conducting evaluation of development projects supported by UNDP/UN agencies, GEF or any donors (30%)
- Relevant professional experience (for at least 10 years) in the technical areas of natural resource management, climate change, agriculture/commodity crops, forestry (15%);
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and (biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, sustainable forest management) including experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis (15%)
- Experience working in Asia Pacific region (5%);
- Knowledge of UNDP or GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy will be an advantage (5%).

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English. Knowledge of Bahasa Indonesia would be an advantage.

Cumulative Analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

K. Ethics

The MTR team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This MTR will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The MTR team 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 MTR team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the MTR and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information, knowledge and data gathered in the MTR process must also be solely used for the MTR and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

L. Schedule of Payments

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR 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%⁹:

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

APPLICATION PROCESS

M. Recommended Presentation of Offer

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹¹);
- 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; (max 1 page)

⁹ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit's senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

¹⁰

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

¹¹

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

- 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 UNDP Indonesia Procurement Unit Menara Thamrin 7-9th Floor Jl. MH Thamrin Kav. 3 Jakarta 10250 in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for (Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan (KALFOR Project) (PIMS 5029) Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY: (bids.id@undp.org) by **(23:59 PM GMT +7 on 12 February 2021)**. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

N. 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.

O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

- ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹²
- ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
- ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹³
- ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table and Rating Scales
- ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form
- ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template
- ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix
- ToR Annex I: List of Stakeholders

¹² The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

¹³ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

(The Commissioning Unit is responsible for compiling these documents prior to the recruitment of the MTR team so that they are available to the team immediately after contract signature.)

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm Land Degradation Focal Area – Portovolio Monitoring and Tracking Tool (PMAT)-GEF-6
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan (KALFOR Project) (PIMS 5029) Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
16. Project site location maps
17. Gender mainstreaming strategy (*Panduan Implementasi Strategi Gender di Tingkat Tapakdalam Program Perlindungan Hutan di Kawasan APL*)
18. Any additional documents, as relevant.

ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report¹⁴

- i. Basic Report Information (*for opening page or title page*)
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
 - MTR time frame and date of MTR report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
 - Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - MTR team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Table of Contents
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (*3-5 pages*)
 - Project Information Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
 - MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
 - Concise summary of conclusions
 - Recommendation Summary Table
2. Introduction (*2-3 pages*)
 - Purpose of the MTR and objectives
 - Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
 - Structure of the MTR report
3. Project Description and Background Context (*3-5 pages*)
 - 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
 - Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
 - Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
 - Project timing and milestones
 - Main stakeholders: summary list
4. Findings (*12-14 pages*)
 - 4.1 Project Strategy
 - Project Design
 - Results Framework/Logframe
 - 4.2 Progress Towards Results
 - Progress towards outcomes analysis
 - Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective
 - 4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
 - Management Arrangements
 - Work planning
 - Finance and co-finance
 - Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
 - Stakeholder engagement
 - Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
 - Reporting
 - Communications & Knowledge Management

¹⁴ The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

- 4.4 Sustainability
 - Financial risks to sustainability
 - Socio-economic to sustainability
 - Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
 - Environmental risks to sustainability
- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations (4-6 pages)
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- 6. Annexes
 - MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
 - MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
 - Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
 - Ratings Scales
 - MTR mission itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
 - Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
 - Signed MTR final report clearance form
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (*METT, FSC, Capacity scorecard, etc.*) or *Core Indicators*
 - *Annexed in a separate file:* GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')

ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)

This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report.

Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
(include evaluative question(s))	(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)	(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the MTR mission, etc.)	(i.e. document analysis, data analysis, interviews with project staff, interviews with stakeholders, etc.)
Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			

ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants¹⁵

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
8. Must ensure that independence of judgement is maintained and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.
9. Must confirm that they have not been involved in designing, executing or advising on the project being evaluated.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ (Place) on _____
(Date)

Signature: _____

¹⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>

ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)		
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.

Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)		
4	Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future
3	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review
2	Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
1	Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)

Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date:

Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date:

ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on **(date)** from the Midterm Review of **(project name)**
(UNDP Project ID-**PIMS #**)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken

ToR ANNEX H: Table Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End of project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
Objective: Maintaining forest area. Including the biodiversity and ecosystem functions of Kalimantan's lowland and montane areas, from the development of estate crops..								
	Total area of HCV equivalent forest within Kalimantan portions of HoB identified, mapped and with significantly enhanced legal protection due to: (1) reclassification from APL to permanent forest; (ii) removal from convertible forest category or (iii) other legal protections (e.g.	Baseline estimate to emerge from mapping exercise during year 1 and 2	Total HCVF = 226,060 ha. Have been Mapped in year 1.	Increase from baseline of 250,000 ha of HCV-equivalent forest	Increase from baseline of 500,000 ha of HCV-equivalent forest			

¹⁶ Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards

¹⁷ Populate with data from the Project Document

¹⁸ If available

¹⁹ Colour code this column only

²⁰ Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
	within plantation set aside rules, KEE implementation etc.							
	2. Number of new partnership mechanism with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.	0 provincial forest and estate crops platforms and 0 multi-province Task Force	newly connected organizations / institutions have been built to include : (1) At national level, particularly at ministerial level, the project has established connection with 6 ministries to include Ministry of Agriculture, BAPPENAS, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Women Empowerment and Children Protection, and Ministry of ATR/BPN, including with SPOI	At least 20 private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue through 3 provincial platforms and 1 multi-province Task Force	At least 30 private sector, civil society, and donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue through 3 provincial platforms and 1 multi-province Task Force			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			project under Ministry of Agriculture and the GGGI initiative; (2) at provinces, districts and field level, the project has established communication and connection to 31 non-forestry sectors provincial offices, 73 technical(non-forestry) sectors district offices, 61 private sectors,40 non-government organizations, 5 professional/community organizations, 1 Climate Change related provincial Task Force, 1 Adat Community / customary					

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			organization, 12 universities and 4 donor organizations newly connected and engaged in broad-based dialogue through 3 provincial platforms					
	3.Number of additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through solutions for management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste	0 additional people	During the first year of operation, the project have involved more than 950 people at national, province, district and community levels to participate in the project's activities. Of these people, about 2/3 of them are the same people and about 15% were forest-direct dependent people. Some of them were	1,000 people from local communities and including forest-dependent peoples, benefitting from strengthened livelihoods due to improved system for protection of ecosystem services (gren goods and services) coming from conserved APL and convertible forest areas.	2,000 people benefitting			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			Adat (customary) communities either under the coordination of AMAN organization (a CSO of customary communities in Indonesia) or other district institutions					
Outcome 1: Forest ecosystem services, including carbon and biodiversity aspects, are more fully taken into account in policies, decision, and management actions at national and provincial (west, Central and East Kalimantan) levels.								
	Number of national and/or provincial-level policy and regulatory changes.	0 policy and regulatory priorities realized	The use of biodiversity issue as indicator of measurement at national policy related with oil palm permit. This has been realized with the adoption of biodiversity issue in the President Instruction No. 8/2018 about	3 policy and regulatory priorities realized	At least 6 changes, including: (1) rules regarding oversight of high biodiversity multiple-use forest landscapes, (2) national and provincial concession-granting processes, (3) regulation governing land classification, including “abandoned lands” regulations, (4)			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			moratorium of oil palm permit issuance, meaning that 100% of biodiversity adoption has been realized oil palm national policy.		establishment of a mechanism to promote / incentivize use of degraded lands by estate crop sector.			
	Arera of high Conservation value (HCV) forests located within the three participating provinces and currently classified as either APL or Convertible forest reclassified and / or subject to new and enforceable regulatory protentions.	Forested APL including HCV areas, has few enforceable or enforced legal or regulatory protections and is therefore subject to high level of conversion.	About 226,000 ha of forest (HCVF) at APL have been revisited for its classification status	At least 100,000 ha of HCV current tly categorized as APL or convertible forest is either reclassified as permanent estate crop or subject to new and enforceable regulatory protection as forested APL. Areas to be prioritized based on factors including:	At least 250,000 ha of HCV current tly categorized as APL or convertible forest is either reclassified as permanent estate crop or subject to new and enforceable regulatory protection as forested APL. Areas to be prioritized based on factors including: ongoing provision of ctirical exosystem serviced and related risk of environmental			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
				ongoing provision of ecological ecosystem services and related risk of environmental damages (peat fire, etc)	damages (peat fire, etc)			
Outcome 2: Policies and plans to deliver global and national benefits from forest conservation and estate crop development are in place in four districts of Kalimantan and innovative approaches to their implementation have been demonstrated in target landscapes containing at least 200,000 ha of forest area currently outside of the estate crop.								
	Tons of CO2 emissions avoided within the three Kalimantan provinces	0 additional tons of CO2e avoided	The quantity of emission avoided in the first year of the project is about = $120 \times 2310 = 277,200$ ton	10 million tons CO2e emissions projected to be avoided on actions to date	24.16 million tons CO2e emissions projected to be avoided on actions to date			
	Area of High Conservation Value (HCV) forests located within the four demonstration landscapes and currently classified as either APL or	For forested APL, including HCV areas, has few enforceable or enforced legal or regulatory protections and is therefore subject to high	the updated collected data of forest area in APL is about 226,060 ha. Of this forest area, about 173,383 ha will be classified as	At least 15,000 ha of HCV currently categorized as APL or convertible forest is either reclassified as	At least 30,000 ha of HCV currently categorized as APL or convertible forest is either reclassified as permanent estate			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
	convertible forest reclassified and/or subject to new and enforceable regulatory protections,	levels of conversion	HCV at least during the project period.	permanent estate crop or subject to new and enforceable regulatory protections as forested APL. Areas to be prioritized based on factors including ongoing provision of critical ecosystem services and related risk of environmental damages (peat fires, etc.).	crop or subject to new and enforceable regulatory protections as forested APL. Areas to be prioritized based on factors including ongoing provision of critical ecosystem services and related risk of environmental damages (peat fires, etc.).			
	Local institution capacity (Note: Baselines and targets to be	Ketapang KPH: # Sintang KPH: #	District of Ketapang KPH: 5 people.	Ketapang KPH: # Sintang KPH: #	Ketapang KPH: # Sintang KPH: # Kota Waringin Barat KPH: #			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
	determined during year 1)	Kota Waringin Barat KPH: # Kutai Timur KPH: #	b. District of Sintang KPH: 4 people. District of Kota Waringin Barat KPH: 2 people District of Kutai Timur KPH: 2 people	Kota Waringin Barat KPH: # Kutai Timur KPH: #	Kutai Timur KPH: #			
	No. of district-level forest safeguarding plans approved and endorsed by key stakeholders	0	the project has conducted activities to do inventory of province and district regulation in relation to forest safeguarding issue.	Draft plans prepared covering an estimated 3.7 million ha of forest, 416,000 ha of which are currently outside of the estate crop	Plans covering an estimated 3.7 million ha of forest, 416,000 ha of which are currently outside of the estate crop.			
	Number of policies and regulatory changes at district level	0 policies and regulatory changes at district level	Most of policies and regulations are issued by national governments. West Kalimantan:	At least 4 revised policies and regulatory changes at district level	At least 8 revised policies and regulatory changes at district level			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			Province regulation = 3 regulation Ketapang district = 2 local regulations Sintang district = 4 perda Central Kalimantan: Province regulation = 1 regulation District of Kotawaringin Barat = 1 regulation					
	Percentage of forested lands within the pilot districts currently classified as either APL or convertible forest that has been reclassified to an enhanced protective status	Approximately 416,000 ha of forested APL and forested convertible forest in four pilot districts	Identified forest in APL of each pilot district based on collected baseline covering 173,384 ha. Reports from the Universities work indicated that the current forest at APL is about 173,385 Ha in the	10% of selected forest areas currently classified as either APL or convertible forest to be reclassified as permanent estate crop, with a	25% of selected forest areas currently classified as either APL or convertible forest to be reclassified as permanent estate crop, with a corresponding shift of non-forested, lower			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			<p>following districts: :</p> <p>a. Kutai Timur district = 131,770 Ha</p> <p>b. Kotawaringin Barat district = 11,123 Ha</p> <p>c. Sintang district = 30,490 ha, and</p> <p>d. Ketapang district = 60,859 ha.</p> <p>If convertible forest is included in the interpretation, total of 226,061 hectares forest areas are in APL distributed as follows:</p>	<p>corresponding shift of non-forested, lower priority areas out of the estate crop, as appropriate. Chosen according to factors including ongoing provision of critical ecosystem services and related risk of environmental damages (peat fires, etc.).</p>	<p>priority areas out of the estate crop, as appropriate. Chosen according to factors including ongoing provision of critical ecosystem services and related risk of environmental damages (peat fires, etc.).</p>			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			1. Kutai Timur about 161,944 Ha 2. Kotawaringin Barat about 33,367 Ha 3. Sintang district about 30,751 ha, and 4. Ketapang district about 82,322 ha.					
Outcome 3: Innovative ways of using financial incentives (and eliminating disincentives), designed to help reduce deforestation and forest fragmentation driven by estate crop development, have been demonstrated in target landscapes within four districts in Kalimantan								
	Incentive mechanisms in place and operational - to drive changes that significantly reduce the longterm threat or actual incidence	Few if any proven schemes in place	The project focused on inventorying and reviewing government regulations for national as well as for local governments in the first year of	Incentive payment schemes designed and ready for implementation	At least four documented examples of incentive payments being used. Together involving at least \$5 million in incentives and			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self-reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
	of estate-crop driven deforestation		implementation. Review of some government regulations on incentives for forestry activities has started from reviewing the Forestry Law No. 41/1999. The Forestry Law mentions incentives should be awarded to some forestry activities under certain requirements. Fiscal Fund: Local Budget Fund (APBD), Village income, and special fund allocation (DAK); b. Village Fund: Village Fund, Village		50,000 ha in avoided deforestation and significant changes in landscape biodiversity health index due to reduced fragmentation, both compared with baselines to be determined in Year 1.			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
			Fund Allocation, and Pure Village Income c. CSR d. International donors					
Outcome 4: : Increased knowledge and understanding of the multiple factors underlying successful implementation of reduced deforestation, green growth strategies for Indonesia's estate crops sector								
	Technical understanding of level of jurisdictional readiness for reduced-deforestation commodity production and impacts of associated capacity building interventions	Baseline capacity assessment using the scorecard methodology developed by the Commodities IAP for four districts.	It is estimated that progress of this indicator is about 20%.	Increase vs. baseline readiness assessment (amount TBD)	Increase vs. baseline readiness assessment (amount TBD)			
	Documented examples of specific lessons shared and	0 examples	The project has published some fliers, policy briefs for provincial	3 examples	7 examples			

Project Strategy	Indicator ¹⁶	Baseline Level ¹⁷	Level in 1 st PIR (self- reported)	Midterm Target ¹⁸	End of project Target	Midterm Level & Assessment ¹⁹	Achievement Rating ²⁰	Justification for Rating
	applied in other sub-national and national situations		government and national governments, video of environment women champions, competition activities to encourage youth in understanding forest and environmental issues.					

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

ToR Annex I: List of Stakeholders (not limited to)

Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to

1. Direktorat General of Forest Plan and Environment Governance, Ministry of Environment and Forestry
2. United Nations Development Program of Indonesia
3. Operation Focal Point of GEF Indonesia
4. National Planning Development Agency
5. Province Government Secretariat of West Kalimantan
6. Province Government Secretariat of Central Kalimantan
7. Province Government Secretariat of East Kalimantan
8. Province Planning Development Agency of West Kalimantan
9. Province Planning Development Agency of Central Kalimantan
10. Province Planning Development Agency of East Kalimantan
11. Province Forestry Office of West Kalimantan
12. Province Forestry Office of Central Kalimantan
13. Province Forestry Office of East Kalimantan
14. Province Environment Office of West Kalimantan
15. Province Environment Office of Central Kalimantan
16. Province Environment Office of East Kalimantan
17. BPKH Pontianak
18. BPKH Samarinda
19. BPKH Palangkaraya
20. LAPAN
21. Dinas Lingkungan Hidup Kotawaringin Barat
22. Dinas Lingkungan Hidup Kutai Timur
23. Dinas Lingkungan Hidup Ketapang
24. Dinas Lingkungan Hidup Sintang
25. Dinas Perkebunan Kotawaringin Barat
26. Dinas Perkebunan Kutai Timur
27. Dinas Perkebunan Ketapang
28. Dinas Perkebunan Sintang
29. Province Forum of West Kalimantan
30. Province Forum of Central Kalimantan
31. Province Forum of East Kalimantan
32. Head of District Office of Sintang
33. Head of District Office of Ketapang
34. Head of District Office of Kotawaringin Barat
35. Head of District Office of Kutai Timur
36. District Forum of Sintang
37. District Forum of Ketapang
38. District Forum of Kotawaringin Barat
39. District Forum of Kutai Timur

40. University of Tanjungpura
41. University of Mulawarman
42. University of Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya
43. IPB University
44. PMU Kalfor
45. RFs Kalfor
46. Other project consultants and local counterparts as appropriate; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

