

# Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

## **BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION**

**Location:** Home-based and Jakarta  
**Application Deadline:** 14 July 2021  
**Type of Contract:** Senior Specialist  
**Type of Contract:** IC  
**Assignment Type:** **TE International Consultant**  
**Languages Required:** English  
**Starting Date:** as soon as possible  
**Duration of Initial Contract:** 35 working days  
**Expected Duration of Assignment:** July – September 2021 (35 working 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 *full-sized* project titled Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Indonesia (PIMS 5499) implemented through the *Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan (YBUL)*. The project started on the *10th of June 2017* and is in its *fourth* 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' ([hyperlink](#)).

The Terms of Reference (ToR) is set for an International Consultant who will work together with a National Consultant in conducting the Terminal Evaluation (TE) (thereafter referred to as the "TE Team") for the project "Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Indonesia".

### **2. Project Description**

The project objective is designed to enhance and maintain socio-ecological resilience of one forested and three coastal landscapes through community-based initiatives in Sulawesi, East Nusa Tenggara, and Bali, Indonesia through the generation of global environmental benefits. The project enable community organizations and NGOs to develop and implement adaptive landscape/seascape management strategies that build social, economic and ecological resilience based on local sustainable development benefits.

The project components are the following:

- Component 1: resilient landscapes for sustainable development and global environmental protection; and
- Component 2: Community-based integrated low-emission systems.

The target landscapes and seascapes are a key forest landscape of Nantu Wild Life Reserve, Gorontalo province, as well as coastal seascapes of Sulawesi (Wakatobi archipelagos); Bali (Nusa Penida island); and East Nusa Tenggara (Semau Island). The key stakeholder to pursue the outcomes of these adaptive landscape/seascape management strategies are: a) community organizations, Indigenous Groups, Forest Protection Committees (FPCs), Federations, Cooperatives, Fishermen's Associations, Women groups, Youth groups, and NGOs as grant project implementers; b) SGP National Steering Committee reviews and approves projects submitted; and c) other stakeholders such as local government, private sector, NGOs and other partners.

The project contributes to SDGs:(a) End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture (2); b) Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all (6), c) Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns (12); and d) Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss (15). In addition, the project responds to all three areas of development work per the UNDP Strategic Plan such as eradicating poverty; structural transformations; and building resilience.

The 4-year project (expected operational closure December 10th, 2021) is executed under UNDP's NGO modality by Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan (YBUL). YBUL is responsible for the day-to-day management and implementation of project activities with the support of a full time Country Program Manager (CPM) and under the leadership of the National Steering Committee (NSC). UNDP performs Project Assurance function by providing independent feedback on progress towards project milestones.

As of to date, GEF SGP Indonesia has exceeded its target with a total of 125,612.51 hectares currently under resilient production landscape and seascape management (267% of the target), covering 71,826.97 hectares of coastal area and 53,785.54 hectares of forested area. The project has supported 73 small grants projects, 2 strategic projects for developing seascapes/landscape strategies and for developing exit strategy project through Terasmitra, and 7 knowledge management projects, totaling 82 projects. GEF SGP Indonesia has been supporting: 34 CBOs and 48 NGOs, with total 10,087 beneficiaries, with a women participation of over 51 percent, to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in productive landscapes, seascapes and sectors in four target landscapes and seascapes in Semau Island, Nusa Penida Island, Wakatobi and Gorontalo. The communities are involved in various management actions including law enforcement, rehabilitation, reforestation, awareness raising and education, capacity building, biodiversity monitoring, policy development, and income creation. The overall total project cost is \$ 3,561,644 (grant amount without fee), with an expected co-financing of \$11,749,385.

Regarding covid-19 outbreak, as of 28 June 2021, there were 2,120,000 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Indonesia, of which 57,138 were fatalities and 1,850,000 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.

The global COVID-19 pandemic has increased the vulnerability of small islands, mainly because almost all small islands in Indonesia depend on external food and energy. The most noticeable impact of COVID-19 is the increasingly limited movement of people and goods to small islands or remote areas.

The GEF SGP Indonesia Phase VI program has components related to the recovery of resilience capacity to meet vital needs such as food, water and energy, which are supported by intact natural ecosystems. In addition, the program has a key component related to developing and strengthening the resilience capacity of local agents in the target landscapes and seascapes, women and men, who have long-term commitment and skills related to resilience (local food security, water availability, environmentally friendly natural resource management, etc. ) and carry out activities even though the GEF SGP Indonesia program has been completed.

### **3. TE Purpose**

The TE will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and draw lessons learnt that can both improve the project's sustainability, and provide input to the enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. The evaluation should include and analyze best practices, specific lessons learned, and recommendations on the strategies to be used and how to implement them. Results of this Terminal Evaluation will be used by key stakeholders (such as GEF, UNDP, grantee partners, government, local governments, etc.) to be replicated by other projects or by other countries, improving their implementation in future programs.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, GEF SGP project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser (Upgraded Country Programmes Global Coordinator (UCP GC) and key stakeholders and grantees.

Evaluation Terminal will conduct an evaluation for program implementation from February 2019 to July 2021.

The evaluation will mainly focus on assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results, impact, coordination and sustainability of GEF SGP Indonesia project efforts and will be applied to all two 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).

#### Relevance

- Is the project relevant to the GEF Focal Area objectives?
- Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area and other relevant focal areas?
- Is the project relevant to Indonesia's environment and sustainable development objectives?
- Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?
- Is the project internally coherent in its design?
- How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?
- Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?
- Is GEF SGP project's theory of change clearly articulated?

- How did GEF SGP Project contribute towards and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of Indonesia?
- How well does GEF SGP project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances?

#### Effectiveness & Results

- Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?
- How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?
- What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?

#### Efficiency

- Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?
- Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?
- Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?
- Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?
- Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)
- Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?
- Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?
- How was results-based management used during project implementation?
- To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?
- Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated?
- What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?
- Which methods were successful or not and why?
- Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?
- What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?

#### Coordination

- To what extent the project adopted a coordinated and participatory approach in mainstreaming gender into policies and programs?
- To what extent the project was effective in coordinating its activities with relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution?

#### Sustainability

- Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the project?
- Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?
- Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable?
- What are the main institutions/organizations in country that will take the project efforts forward after project end and what is the budget they have assigned to this?
- Were the results of efforts made during the project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures?
- Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support?
- What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results?

- Were laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?
- What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the project?
- Are there policies or practices in place that create perverse incentives that would negatively affect long-term benefits?
- Are there adequate incentives to ensure sustained benefits achieved through the project?
- Are there risks to the environmental benefits that were created or that are expected to occur?
- Are there long-term environmental threats that have not been addressed by the project?
- Have any new environmental threats emerged in the project's lifetime?
- Is the capacity in place at the regional, national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?
- Is there potential to scale up or replicate project activities?
- Did the project's Exit Strategy actively promote replication?
- Which areas/arrangements under the project show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results?
- What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the project initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?

#### Gender equality and women's empowerment

- What factors contribute or influence GEF SGP Indonesia project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective and women's economic empowerment.

The TE report will comprise a clear explanation of the methodology used, adequately address cross cutting areas including gender and human rights and include logical and well-articulated conclusions based on the findings which are linked to and supported by evidence. The TE will adhere to evaluation standards of integrity, accountability, transparency, and objectivity.

The TE will occur during the last 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.

## **DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **4. TE Approach & Methodology**

The TE 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 mission begins.

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 Advisors, 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, National Steering Committee of GEF SGP Indonesia, local government and grantee-partners, etc. Additionally, the TE team is expected to conduct field missions, including the following project sites Semau, Nusa Penida, Gorontalo, and Wakatobi. If the COVID19 pandemic travel restrictions are still ongoing, then 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 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 should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

If the COVID19 pandemic travel restrictions are still ongoing, then 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 TE team has the flexibility to determine the best methods and tools to collect and analyze data. The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP stakeholders and the TE team.

The final TE report should 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's achievements in accordance to the set of agreed 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 (<https://tinyurl.com/68h94cp6>).

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

### iv. 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 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.

## 6. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The TE consultant/team shall prepare and submit:

- TE Inception Report: TE team clarifies objectives and methods of the TE no later than *2 weeks* before the TE mission. TE team submits the Inception Report to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Approximate due date: *(13 August 2021)*
- Presentation: TE team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *(27 August 2021)*
- Draft TE Report: TE team submits full draft report with annexes within 3 weeks of the end of the TE mission. Approximate due date: *(06 September 2021)*
- Final TE Report\* and Audit Trail: TE team submits revised report, with Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report, to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Approximate due date: *(10 September 2021)*

\*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.<sup>1</sup>

## 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 Country Office in Indonesia.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants 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

---

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

liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

Due to the COVID-19, the Commissioning Unit and Project Team will support the implementation of remote/virtual meetings. An updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) will be provided by the Commissioning Unit to the TE team.

## 8. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *35 working days* over a time period of *7 weeks* starting *29 July 2021* and shall not exceed five months from when the TE team is hired. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

- *14 July 2021*: Application closes
- *28 July 2021* Selection of TE Team
- *29 July 2021*: Prep the TE team (handover of project documents)
- *02 August 2021*: 02 days: Document review and preparing TE Inception Report
- *13 August 2021*: 01 days: Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report- latest start of TE mission
- *13 August – 26 August 2021*: 14 days: TE mission: (online) stakeholder meetings, (online) interviews, field visits (if possible)
- *27 August 2021*: Assessment wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of TE mission
- *01 September 2021*: 05 days: Preparation of draft TE report
- *06 September 2021*: Circulation of draft TE report for comments
- *08 September 2021*: 03 days: Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
- *09 September 2021*: Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- *10 September 2021*: (optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop
- *16 September 2021*: Expected date of full TE completion

The expected date start date of contract is *29 July 2021*.

## 9. Duty Station

Home-based with potential travel to Indonesia, should Covid-19-related restrictions allow.

### Travel:

- International travel may be required to Indonesia during the TE mission, should restrictions related to Covid-19 allow;
- 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 and Required Qualifications**

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.

If the COVID19 pandemic travel restrictions are still ongoing, then the International Consultant will work with the National Consultant. The International Consultant will operate remotely using tools to conduct virtual interviews and consultations. Please refer to Annex I for the main responsibilities / contributions of the national expert in the evaluation.

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

#### Education

- Master’s degree in environment, sustainable development, and community-based development or other closely related field;

#### Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to *biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation*;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in developing countries in Asia;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years*;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and *biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation*; experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset.
- Experience with the GEF Small Grants Programme 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 MTR 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 PROCESS**

### **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.);
- If possible for travelling, for duty travels, the UN’s Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates are (Jakarta, Bali, East Nusa Tenggara, Gorontalo, and Wakatobi), which should provide indication of the cost of living in a duty station/destination (*Note: Individuals on this contract are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the ToR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.*)
- 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 [template](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#));
- 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)
- 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 by email at the following address ONLY: (*bids.id@undp.org*) by 23:59 PM GMT +7 on 14 July 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. Annexes to Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

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

### ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification
<b>Project Objective<sup>2</sup> To enhance and maintain socio-ecological resilience of one forested and three coastal landscapes through community-based initiatives in Sulawesi, East Nusa Tenggara, and Bali, Indonesia</b>	<p>A. Increased area of sustainably managed production integrating biodiversity conservation in one forested and three coastal landscapes</p> <p>B. Increased number of producers participating in community based adaptive landscape planning and management in one</p>	<p>5,000 ha sustainably managed in the one forested and three coastal landscapes</p> <p>500 producers participating in community based landscape planning and management processes</p>	<p>At least 47,000 ha with sustainable activities under implementation in the forested and coastal landscapes</p> <p>At least 2,500 producers participating in</p>	<p>Use of community-generated maps, along with aerial photos or other remote imaging as needed, to create maps of land use and forest cover to monitor progress.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
	forested and three coastal landscapes		community based landscape planning and management	Project reports
	<p>C. Increased number of communities, within the one forested and three coastal landscapes, participating in capacity development activities, to improve the social and financial sustainability of their organizations.</p> <p>D. Increased number of knowledge sharing events and products</p>	<p>500 livestock producers trained in silvopastoral systems</p> <p>25 CSO representatives participating in trainings to improve the financial and administrative sustainability their community organizations</p>	<p>At least 1,000 producers trained in agro-ecological practices and systems</p> <p>Up to 500 livestock producers trained in silvopastoral systems</p> <p>At least 300 CSO representatives participating in trainings to improve the financial and administrative sustainability of their community organizations</p> <p>At least 12 workshops for knowledge sharing, exchange of experiences best practices, and fora in which project participants have participated</p>	<p>Project Reports</p> <p>APR/PIR Reports</p> <p>MTE/FT Evaluations</p> <p>NC reports on the advance of projects</p> <p>M&amp;E system of the project keeps track of progress towards targets.</p>
<b>Component 1: Resilient landscapes for sustainable</b>	1.1.1 Increased number of multistakeholder governance	No multi-stakeholder	At least four multi-	Landscape management

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
<p><b>development and global environmental protection</b></p> <p><b>Outcome 1.1</b></p> <p>1.1. Community-based institutional governance structures and networks in place in three coastal and marine landscapes and one forested landscape (Gorontalo, Wakatobi Islands, Semau Island and Nusa Penida Island) for effective participatory decision making to achieve resiliency</p>	<p>platforms established and strengthened to support participatory landscape planning and adaptive management in one forested and three coastal landscapes</p> <p>1.1.2 Participatory landscape strategies and adaptive management plans for the one forested and three coastal landscapes</p> <p>1.1.3 Number and typology of community level and strategic projects developed and agreed by multi-stakeholder groups (together with eligibility criteria) as outputs to achieve landscape level outcomes</p> <p>1.1.4 Number of case studies on participatory adaptive landscape management</p>	<p>governance platforms established in the four landscapes</p> <p>0 strategies to enhance social and ecological resilience of the one forested and three coastal landscapes</p> <p>Four community-based projects identified and aligned with landscape strategies, identified and agreed by multi-stakeholder groups during the project lifetime and implemented by CBOs and NGOs in partnership with others in the four areas</p> <p>Traditional systems exist but weakened due to multiple factors</p>	<p>stakeholder landscape governance platforms in place and functioning</p> <p>Four landscape management strategies and plans delineating landscape level outcomes and other elements</p> <p>At least 16 community-based projects identified and aligned with landscape strategies</p> <p>Four revitalized knowledge management systems</p> <p>Four case studies on participatory adaptive landscape management (one per landscape)</p>	<p>plans and agreements</p> <p>Key CSO stakeholders identified and involved</p> <p>Number of cooperation agreements with organizations and institutions</p> <p>GPS mapping and characterization of socio-economic and geographic features of landscapes</p> <p>Participatory appraisal that identifies strengths, weaknesses and lessons learned</p> <p>Documentation of the multi-stakeholder group conformation process</p> <p>Legal document or decree formalizing these platforms</p> <p>Minutes of meetings</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1.2</b></p> <p>Ecosystem services within targeted landscapes are</p>	<p>1.2.1 Increased area under protection for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</p>	<p>Four community based project for biodiversity conservation and sustainability used</p>	<p>Approximately 10,000 hectares managed as marine and/or terrestrial</p>	<p>Project implementation reports</p>

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
enhanced through multi-functional land-use systems		in the three coastal and marine landscapes and one forested landscape	community conservation areas	APR/PIR Mid Term Review
	1.2.2 Increased area under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration	0 hectares under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration  0 ha planted with trees/bushes in reforestation campaigns in one forested and three coastal landscapes	At least 10,000 hectares under reforestation or farmer managed natural regeneration  At least 5,000 ha planted with trees/bushes in reforestation campaigns in the forested and three coastal landscapes	
	1.2.3 Increased area of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources	At least 55 hectares of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources  At least 20,000 trees planted in agroforestry systems	At least 14,000 hectares of agricultural land under agro-ecological practices and systems that increase sustainability and productivity and/or conserve crop genetic resources  At least 100,000 trees planted in agroforestry systems  At least 8,000 hectares of silvopastoral systems established	

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
<p><b>Outcome 1.3</b></p> <p>The sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes is strengthened through integrated agro-ecological practices.</p>	<p>1.3.1 Number of multi-stakeholder groups active in the one forested and three coastal landscapes with strategies/plans for sustainable production of non-timber forest product, craft and fisheries production through Terasmitra.</p> <p>1.3.2 Number of community based organizations established or strengthened in the one forested and three coastal land landscapes grouping individual community producer organizations in sustainable production of non-timber forest product, craft and fisheries production through Terasmitra.</p>	<p>No multi-stakeholder groups with a focus on landscape resilience engaged in analysis and planning of strategic approaches to upscaling successful experiences with ecotourism or commercial production of key agricultural products</p> <p>No strategy currently exists in any of the landscapes to enable and facilitate upscaling by community organizations of these economic activities based on the detailed analysis of successful SGP supported community experiences and identification of upscaling requirements and opportunities</p>	<p>At least four landscapes level multi-stakeholder groups involved in analysis of experience, lessons learned and development of strategies for sustainable production of non-timber forest product, craft and fisheries production through Terasmitra</p> <p>At least 16 community based organizations established or strengthened.</p>	<p>Project implementation reports</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1.4</b></p> <p>Livelihoods of communities in the target landscapes are improved by developing eco-friendly small-scale community enterprises and improving market access</p>	<p>1.4.1 Alternative livelihoods and innovative products developed through support of activities that promote market access as well as microfinance opportunities and other services.</p>	<p>15 projects funded in previous operational phases.</p>	<p>At least 20 additional income generating activities being implemented that represent sustainable</p>	<p>Project reports</p> <p>Workshop reports</p> <p>NC reports</p> <p>APR/PIR</p> <p>MTE/TE evaluations</p>

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
			livelihood options	
	1.4.2 Increased number of case study publications documenting lessons learned from SGP-supported projects	One case study publications prepared and disseminated in previous Operational Phases	At least three case study publications documenting lessons learned from SGP-supported projects	Project reports Workshop reports NC reports APR/PIR
	1.4.3 Traditional knowledge of native crop/livestock genetic resources documented and disseminated	Communication strategy outdated  Traditional knowledge of genetic resources relatively poorly documented and difficult to access for non-academics	Communication strategy under implementation  At least two publications and other forms of communication regarding traditional knowledge of native crop/livestock genetic resources	MTE/TE evaluations
	1.4.4 Farmers Rights under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture discussed and materials disseminated	Farmers Rights poorly understood	At least two knowledge fairs or workshops regarding genetic resources and farmers' rights  At least one regional/national workshop on Farmers' Rights under the International Treaty on Plant Genetic	

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
			Resources for Food and Agriculture	
Component 2. Community-based integrated low-emission systems  Outcome 2.1: Multi-stakeholder partnerships in place for managing the development and implementation of community-based integrated low-emission systems.	2.1.1 Increased number of multi-stakeholder partnerships for managing the development and implementation of community-based integrated low-emission systems  2.1.2 Targeted community grant projects (including strategic projects) to build the capacities of selected community organizations to plan strategically, operate efficiently, and monitor the use of renewable energy	No partnerships currently established  No community members with the capacity to plan strategically, operate efficiently or monitor the use of renewable energy	Four partnerships established and functioning  30 community representatives have the capacity to plan strategically, operate efficiently and monitor the use of renewable energy	Project reports Workshop reports NC reports APR/PIR MTE/TE evaluations
Outcome 2.2: Increased adoption (or development, demonstration and financing) of renewable and energy efficient technologies and mitigation options at community level	2.2.1. Increased use of renewable energy technologies at a community scale implemented in the target landscape: i) increased numbers of fuel efficient stoves in use; (ii) increased number of solar panels dscape including:  2.2.2 Knowledge from innovative project experience is shared for replication and upscaling of community-based integrated low-emission systems across the landscape, across the country, and to the global SGP network	Limited number of solar panel and other renewable energy applications to support HH needs and farming activities:  Negligible knowledge compiled or disseminated	At least 500 fuel efficient stoves in use  At least 200 solar panels installed and in use  At least five experiences evaluated, codified, and disseminated in appropriate media	Project reports Workshop reports NC reports APR/PIR MTE/TE evaluations  Publications Web posting

	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets End of Project</b>	<b>Source of verification</b>
			A model of innovative energy management for efficiency at selected villages established	

**ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team**

#	Item (electronic versions preferred if available)
1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages)
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions

15	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
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	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
21	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)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e. any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	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
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
28	Gender action plan

## ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report

- i. Title 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
- ii. Acknowledgements
- iii. Table of Contents
- iv. Acronyms and Abbreviations
1. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)
  - Project Information Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Ratings Table
  - Concise summary of findings, conclusions and lessons learned

- Recommendations summary table
2. Introduction (2-3 pages)
    - Purpose and objective of the TE
    - Scope
    - Methodology
    - Data Collection & Analysis
    - Ethics
    - Limitations to the evaluation
    - Structure of the TE report
  3. Project 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
  4. Findings
 

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be given a rating<sup>3</sup>)

    - 4.1 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
      - Cover assessment/evaluation of cross cutting in every aspect under point 4. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3)
    - 4.2. 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
      - Risk Management incl. Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
    - 4.3 Project Results
      - Progress towards objective and expected outcomes (\*)

---

<sup>3</sup> See ToR Annex F for rating scales.

- Relevance (\*)
  - Effectiveness (\*)
  - Efficiency (\*)
  - Overall Outcome (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Gender
  - Other Cross-cutting Issues
  - 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
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Main Findings
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations
  - Lessons Learned
6. 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

## **ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix**

NOTE: Include COVID-19 specific questions, as needed.

<b>Evaluative Criteria Questions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF Focal area, and to the environment and development priorities a the local, regional and national level?</b>			
Is the project relevant to the GEF Focal Area objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</li> <li>• Extent to which the project is implemented in line with incremental cost argument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally</li> <li>• UNCBD and other international convention web sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents Analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</li> <li>• UNDP Guidance for conducting evaluations during COVID-19</li> </ul>
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area and other relevant focal areas?	Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• GEF focal areas strategies and documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• GEF website</li> <li>• Interviews with UNDP and project team</li> </ul>
Is the project relevant to Indonesia's environment and sustainable development objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>• Degree of coherence between the project and national's priorities, policies and strategies</li> <li>• Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</li> <li>• Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</li> <li>• Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• National policies and strategies</li> <li>• Key project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with UNDP and project partners</li> </ul>
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project partners and stakeholders</li> <li>• Needs assessment studies</li> <li>• Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Guidance for Conducting TE of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects</li> <li>• UNDP Guidance for conducting evaluations</li> </ul>

			during COVID-19 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
Is the project internally coherent in its design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program and project documents</li> <li>Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Key interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is GEF SGP project's theory of change clearly articulated?</li> <li>How did GEF SGP Project contribute towards and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of Indonesia?</li> <li>How well does GEF SGP project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>Level of coherence between project expected results and individual CBOs/NGOs proposals</li> <li>Adequacy of Indicators (SMART)</li> <li>Evidence of gender monitoring</li> <li>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities: evidence of incorporation of their perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>UNDP/GEF/SGP policies and strategies</li> <li>National policies and strategies</li> <li>Key project partners and stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>UNDP website</li> <li>GEF SGP website</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP, GEF/SGP, project staff and participating national stakeholders</li> <li>Guidance for Conducting TE of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects</li> <li>UNDP Guidance for conducting evaluations during COVID-19</li> <li>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents from other donor supported activities</li> <li>Other donor representatives</li> <li>Project documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analyses</li> <li>Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project team</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</li> <li>• Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>• Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Project documents and reporting</li> <li>• Project Case Studies</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF-SGP, project staff and partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> <li>• Project documents and reporting</li> <li>• Project Case Studies</li> </ul>	Data analysis
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
<p>Was project support provided in an efficient way?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>• Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>• Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>• Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>• Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>• Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>• Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost</li> <li>• Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)</li> <li>• Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>• Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP/ GEF SGP</li> <li>• Project team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</li> <li>• Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</li> <li>• Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>• Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?</li> <li>• How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> </ul>			
<p>How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> <li>• Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated?</li> <li>• What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</li> <li>• Which methods were successful or not and why?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</li> <li>• Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>• Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>• Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<p>Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</li> <li>• Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</li> <li>• Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?:</li> <li>• What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</li> <li>• How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</li> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</li> </ul>		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-political, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy</li> <li>• Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
Financial sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?</li> <li>• Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project ends</li> <li>• Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main institutions/organizations in country that will take the project efforts forward after project end and what is the budget they have assigned to this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and funding sources for those recurrent costs</li> </ul>		
<p>Institutional and governance sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the results of efforts made during the project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures?</li> <li>• Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support?</li> <li>• What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results?</li> <li>• Were laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?</li> <li>• What is the level of political commitment to build on the results of the project?</li> <li>• Are there policies or practices in place that create perverse incentives that would negatively affect long-term benefits?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations</li> <li>• Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end</li> <li>• Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies</li> <li>• State of enforcement and law making capacity</li> <li>• Evidences of commitment by government enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<p>Are there adequate incentives to ensure sustained benefits achieved through the project?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP , project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Documentation review</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there risks to the environmental benefits that were created or that are expected to occur?</li> <li>• Are there long-term environmental threats that have not been addressed by the project?</li> <li>• Have any new environmental threats emerged in the project's lifetime?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of potential threats such as infrastructure development</li> <li>• Assessment of unaddressed or emerging threats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Threat assessments</li> <li>• Government documents or other external published information</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP, project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Documentation review</li> </ul>
<p>Is the capacity in place at the regional, national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?</p>	<p>Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (regional, national and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP, project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> <li>• Capacity assessments available, if any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Documentation review</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there potential to scale up or replicate project activities?</li> <li>• Did the project's Exit Strategy actively promote replication?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number/quality of replicated initiatives</li> <li>• Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives</li> <li>• Scale of additional investment leveraged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Exit Strategy</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP, project personnel and project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts?</li> <li>• Have any of these been addressed through project management?</li> <li>• What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above</li> <li>• Recent changes which may present new challenges to the project</li> <li>• Education strategy and partnership with school, education institutions etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> <li>• UNDP/GEF SGP, project personnel and project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which areas/arrangements under the project show the strongest potential for lasting long-term results?</li> <li>• What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the project</li> </ul>		<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p>	<p>Data analysis</p>

initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?			
Gender equality and women's empowerment: How did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?			
What factors contribute or influence GEF SGP Indonesia project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women's economic empowerment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender Action Plan</li> <li>• Project documents and reporting</li> <li>• Project Case Studies</li> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>	Data analysis

## ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

**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 imitations, 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 and did not carry out the project’s Mid-Term Review.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

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: \_\_\_\_\_

## ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales & Evaluation Ratings Table

<b>TE Rating Scales</b>	
<b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, Implementation/Oversight, Execution, Relevance</b>	<b>Sustainability ratings:</b>
<p>6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings</p> <p>5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings</p> <p>4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings</p> <p>3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings</p> <p>2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings</p> <p>1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment</p>	<p>4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability</p> <p>2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability</p> <p>1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability</p> <p>Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability</p>

<b>Evaluation Ratings Table</b>	
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation (M&amp;E)</b>	<b>Rating<sup>4</sup></b>
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
<b>Implementation &amp; Execution</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
<b>Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Rating</b>

<sup>4</sup> Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point rating scale: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 = Satisfactory (S), 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2 = Unsatisfactory (U), 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4 = Likely (L), 3 = Moderately Likely (ML), 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1 = Unlikely (U)

Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

## ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form

<b>Terminal Evaluation Report for (Project Title &amp; UNDP PIMS ID) Reviewed and Cleared By:</b>	
<b>Commissioning Unit (M&amp;E Focal Point)</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
<b>Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)</b>	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

## ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

*This Audit Trail should be listed as an annex in the final TE report but not attached to the report file.*

**To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of** Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF SGP in Indonesia (PIMS5529).

The following comments were provided to the draft TE report; they are referenced by institution/organization (do not include the commentator's name) and track change comment number ("#" column):

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



## Annex I: Main Responsibilities/Contributions to the Evaluation of the National Consultant

National Consultant Task	Notes	Format Use
<p>Provide input into the Inception Report to be drafted by the IC. In particular, the NC should:</p> <p>1) consult with the PMU to develop the draft project site visit itinerary, taking into consideration guidelines on site visits and stakeholder consultations provided by the International Consultant/Team Leader (IC)</p> <p>2) prepare an evaluation question matrix to be used in conjunction with that prepared by the IC and focused specifically on those consultations that will take place during field visits.</p>	<p>The NC should review list of stakeholders to be met as proposed in the initial draft of the Inception Report and provide comments as to additional stakeholders to meet or, in the case that stakeholders included in the list of proposed consultations are not as important as may have appeared to the IC, indicate where these meetings may not be priority.</p>	
<p>Maintain the up-to-date actual itinerary of the Evaluation Team (ET) for all in-country meetings conducted</p>	<p>Although a tentative itinerary is provided for the ET, the actual itinerary is often significantly different. We need to include an accurate actual itinerary in the evaluation report.</p>	<p>Use format provided by IC. See Form A</p>
<p>Maintain up-to-date comprehensive list of persons met by the ET (all meetings, including those held by zoom, skype or otherwise virtually)</p>	<p>Actual stakeholders met by the ET usually varies from what was originally planned. We need to include the actual list of all stakeholders met in the evaluation report.</p>	<p>Use format provided by IC. See Form B</p>
<p>Prepare list of all products/outputs (technical reports, land use or management plans, curricula, etc.) produced with project financial support</p>	<p>A good starting point is to review the project Mid-Term Review (MTR) as this should have information as to what was produced as of the time of the MTR.</p>	<p>Use format provided by IC. See Form C</p>
<p>Review products as indicated by the IC &amp; provide product assessment</p>		<p>Use format provided by IC See Form C</p>
<p>Prepare list of all trainings conducted with project financial support</p>	<p>A good starting point is to review the project Mid-Term Review (MTR) as this should have information as to what trainings were conducted as of the time of the MTR.</p>	<p>Use format provided by IC See Form D</p>
<p>At outset of assignment, brief IC on updated institutional/ policy/legislative frameworks</p>	<p>Although the ICs will have read the PRODOC which normally describes this in some detail, several years will have passed</p>	

relevant to the project and on key relevant in-country initiatives (national and state government programmes/campaigns), NGO activities, and donor-supported projects).	since the time the PRODOC was written and significant changes may have taken place. It is important for the entire evaluation team to be up-to-date on the institutional, policy, and legislative frameworks.	
Undertake in-country consultations	In the event that the IC is not present in country due to COVID restrictions, the NC will undertake all in-country consultations. The IC will participate remotely when feasible and when this would not be obtrusive or distracting for stakeholders being interviewed.	
Summarize each consultation undertaken ensuring that important data is recorded that allows for detailed, evidence-based observations and conclusions to be drawn.	Although all ET members involved in meetings will normally do this, during COVID restrictions that do not allow the IC to be physically present at meetings (and in some cases, not even present remotely), the primary responsibility for capture of detailed data shared during such meetings is with the NC. For example, mention may be made that 67 out of 123 farmers who underwent crab farming training provided by the project are not currently engaged in crab farming. Although is clear that crab farming was not broadly adopted by that group, the specific figures should be recorded as best as possible. Often people interviewed will cite facts and figures quickly and move on without pause. It is our job to ensure we capture important data as we go.	Use format provided See Form E
Engage with IC in review and analysis of important information gained during the day's meetings during regularly scheduled twice weekly zoom or skype calls	This is normally done at the end of each day to ensure important information is captured and that team members are able to share their perspectives and analysis for a more thorough and accurate evaluation. Due to COVID restrictions that do not allow the IC to be present in country, and given that internet access may be limited during field visits, twice weekly zoom or skype calls will be planned instead.	
Engage with IC in analysis of evaluation findings	All team members have been contracted because of their relevant expertise. All should contribute to the analysis of information obtained during the evaluation to ensure an accurate, objective, thorough evaluation.	

<p>Participate as requested by the IC in the preliminary presentation of evaluation findings</p>	<p>This is done on the last day of the in-country mission or, with COVID restrictions in place, shortly thereafter. Normally, UNDP, the PMU, the Government, and key involved implementing entities and NGOs are present. This is not a “PowerPoint” presentation. It is an informal presentation which provides an opportunity for the ET to share its preliminary findings for feedback from key stakeholders, to ensure accuracy, to fill in information gaps, and to better understand different perspectives on issues raised by the evaluation.</p>	
<p>Take photos of site visits for inclusion in the evaluation report.</p>	<p>This should be done in a non-intrusive way. Indeed, if the NC is comfortable asking someone else to do this, this is preferable. All photos should be labelled with brief description including location.</p>	
<p>Fill in information gaps as needed following drafting of Evaluation report by IC</p>	<p>There is sometimes a need to follow-up to obtain specific information after the in-country mission is over. The NC is best placed to do this.</p>	