



Sustainable Environment and Effective Use of Energy

**Outcome Evaluation
2006-2010**

Prepared for:
UNDP Indonesia

By:
Denika Blacklock Karim

July 2011

Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to thank all UNDP staff in Jakarta for their support and cooperation during the field work for this evaluation. Special thanks are due to Angger Wibowo, Budhi Sayoko and Sirman Purba for their guidance and support in implementing this evaluation, and to Ratih Saraswati for her help with logistics and setting up appointments for the evaluator.

Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	6
1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation.....	7
1.2 Key issues addressed by the Evaluation.....	7
2. Evaluation Context and Methodology.....	9
2.1 Programmatic context of the Evaluation.....	9
2.2 Methodology of the Evaluation.....	9
2.3 Limitations of the Evaluation.....	10
3. The Development Context.....	12
3.1 Overview of historical trends and development challenges.....	12
3.2 Response of the Government of Indonesia to environmental challenges.....	14
3.3 UNDP Responses.....	15
4. Findings and Conclusions.....	22
4.1 Relevance (of UNDP’s involvement and its approach).....	22
4.2 Effectiveness (in contributing to the achievement of outcomes).....	23
4.3 Efficiency (in delivering outputs).....	27
4.4 Sustainability (of the outcome).....	28
5. Recommendations of the Evaluation.....	30
Annex 1 - Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.....	32
Annex 2 - Evaluation Questions.....	37
Annex 3 - Stakeholders Interviewed.....	39
Annex 4 - Documents Referenced.....	40

Executive Summary

UNDP Indonesia commissioned an evaluation of the energy and environment outcome for its 2006-2010 Country Programme Action Plan in order to clearly identify how the UNDP Country Programme contributes to the development results of Indonesia. The outcome evaluation assesses how and why the outcome has or has not been achieved, and the role that UNDP has played. The evaluation will also aim to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, providing recommendations to improve performance in future programming and partnership building, and generate lessons learned.

As the UNDP Indonesia Country Programme underwent a Mid-Term Review in 2008 and an Assessment of Development Results in 2009, this evaluation aimed to verify and build on the findings as pertained to the environment programme and outcome of the country programme. It also aimed to be 'forward looking' with respect to the new country programme cycle for 2011-2015, and the acceleration of the Government of Indonesia's initiatives in relation to addressing environmental issues and the climate change agenda.

The evaluation found that the UNDP 2006-2010 environment programme was aligned with the national priorities for environment and sustainable development, and was viewed by government stakeholders as critical as it strategically targeted sectors which allowed the Government to gain momentum in addressing environment and climate change challenges. All government stakeholders noted that UNDP's role was critical in acting as a 'convenor' – bringing together the various actors (governmental and non-governmental) to more coherently address climate change and environment. Prior to 2008, these issues were perceived to be the sole responsibility of the Ministry of Environment. However, following the COP 13, the importance of the involvement of and coordination between line ministries was increasingly recognized and acted upon.

One of the key contributions of UNDP has been its ability to use its own funding (TRAC funds) to initiate demonstration projects which have then been used to leverage additional financing from global resources and the GoI. These demonstration projects have brought to the attention of the GoI the importance of investing in projects for energy efficiency, renewable energy, ODS reduction, and forest and water shed management. The positive results of these projects have generally resulted in UNDP:GoI cost-sharing in the range of USD 1:USD 20-25. However, a key gap is that the lessons from the demonstration projects are not feeding into the policy and planning processes at the national level.

UNDP's partnership strategy was to facilitate and build partnerships *between* government agencies, and *between* government agencies and non-governmental actors (civil society, private sector, police), viewed by UNDP as the most effective way to move the environment agenda forward. The government views UNDP as a neutral, trustworthy partner lacking a hidden agenda. This has allowed the government to fast track their environment agenda (compared to the pace it would advance without UNDP's facilitation) and to leverage international funds (which will facilitate the implementation of environment sustainability and climate change adaptation/mitigation programming over the coming five years).

However, while change against the stated outcome has been nominal against the indicator criteria outlined in the CPAP, change in the capacity of the (central) government to address environment and climate change issues has markedly improved, for which UNDP can be credited with substantive contributions particularly in the awareness, policy, financial and coordination capacities. These changes contribute to the sustainability and acceleration of the environment agenda, and to the achievement of the environment outcomes in the 2011-2015 CPAP.

Nonetheless, the evaluation noted that the sustainability of capacity development remains a critical issue, and should be a centre point of the 2011-2015 CPAP. With UNDP support, the awareness of environmental and climate change issues has noticeably improved, and with it critical improvements in coordination, communication and planning across sectors. However, without adequate implementation capacity – at both the central and local levels (where implementation and enforcement will primarily take place) the momentum gained in addressing the environment agenda risks losing ground.

Therefore, this evaluation has provided two strategic recommendations for the UNDP Country Programme 2011-2015:

Recommendation 1. Revise the environment component of the 2011-2015 CPAP in order to ensure that the focus of UNDP strategic support builds on its contributions and successes of the 2006-2010 CPAP, and that critical areas of UNDP’s mandate are mainstreamed, monitored and evaluated.

Recommendation 2. Focus UNDP’s internal capacity development and learning on strategic processes which the government has highlighted as areas where UNDP’s support is urgently required in order to maximise the impacts of environment and climate change programmes.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADR	Assessment of Development Results
BAPPENAS	National Development Planning Agency
BAU	Business as Usual
CBFWM	Community-based Forest and Watershed Management
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
COP	Conference of Parties
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
ES&L	Energy Standards and Labelling
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GoI	Government of Indonesia
ICCTF	Indonesia Climate Change Trust Fund
MCT	Microturbine Cogeneration Technology
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MME	Ministry of Mines and Energy
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MTR	Mid-term Review
ODS	Ozone-depleting Substances
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Criteria
RANPI	National Action Plan on Climate Change
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF/UNPDF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework/United Nations Partnership for Development Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNREDD	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

As one of the key international development partners in the country, UNDP is challenged to prove that its development programmes are contributing to the country's development achievements, specifically to point out how those effective and well-managed UNDP's projects were able to contribute to the improvement of people's lives in the country.

The growing demand for development effectiveness is largely based on the realization that producing good deliverables is simply not enough. Efficient or well-managed development projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no discernible improvements in development conditions and ultimately in people's lives. Being a key international development agency, UNDP has been increasing its focus on the achievement of clearly stated results.

As such, UNDP has shifted from traditional project monitoring and evaluation to results-oriented monitoring and evaluation, especially outcome monitoring and evaluation that cover a set of related projects, programmes and partnership strategies intended to bring about a higher level outcome. To clearly identify how the UNDP Country Programme contributes to the development results of Indonesia, this evaluation has been commissioned to evaluate the following outcome:

***CPAP Outcome #2:** By 2010, improved environmental living conditions and sustainable use of energy in Indonesia and establishment of sustainable living conditions in the targeted provinces in Indonesia.*

The outcome evaluation assesses how and why the outcome has or has not been achieved, and the role that UNDP has played. The evaluation will also aim to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, providing recommendations to improve performance in future programming and partnership building, and generate lessons learned.

1.2 Key issues addressed by the Evaluation

The outcome is influenced by the full range of UNDP activities — projects, programmes, non-project activities and "soft" assistance within and outside of projects. The outcome will also be influenced by the activities of other development actors.

As outlined in the UNDP 'Guidance on Outcome Level Evaluations,' the four standard objectives of the outcome evaluation will be:

- To assess progress towards the outcome;
- To assess the factors affecting to the outcome;
- To assess the key UNDP contributions (outputs), including those produced through "soft" assistance, to the outcome; and
- To assess the partnership strategy.

This evaluation report details the development context in which UNDP is operating and contributing to the outcome, presents findings on each of the four objectives outlined above, and presents forward-looking recommendations upon which UNDP can scale-up, refine or more strategically target its programme and assistance for the next five year programming cycle (2011-2015) in Indonesia.

The results of the evaluation will be utilised by UNDP and its partners (government, civil society, private sector) to enhance contributions (policy and legislative development and implementation; advocacy and awareness raising; cooperation between government and the private sector; community-level projects; and capacity building of all facets of Indonesian society) to the environment agenda in Indonesia, South-South cooperation and support the Government of Indonesia's MDG targets.

2. Evaluation Context and Methodology

2.1 Programmatic context of the Evaluation

UNDP implements a results-based programmatic approach that details expected outcomes within the Country Programme Document (CPD), and accompanying Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for a five year programming cycle. The CPD and CPAP contribute to, and are aligned with, the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) – renamed the United Nations Partnership for Development Framework for the current programming cycle (2011-2015). The programme cycle covered by this evaluation is for the period 2006-2010.

The UNDAF and CPD/CPAP draw priority areas from the Government of Indonesia's Medium Term Development Framework for corresponding programming cycles. This ensures that development activities generate contributions with the maximum level of effectiveness, and creates a deeper ownership of the development results by government.

The 2006-2010 CPD/CPAP for Indonesia is divided into five programme areas:

- Strengthening Human Development to Achieve the MDGs
- Supporting Sustainable Environment and the Effective Use of Energy
- Promoting Democratic Governance
- Reducing Vulnerability to Crisis; and
- Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Aceh and North Sumatra

Each programme area has a corresponding outcome with contributing outputs. The CPD also provides a situational analysis for each programme including lessons learned from the previous programme cycle, details of the proposed programme, a stakeholder analysis, a partnership strategy, details of programme management, monitoring and evaluation, as well as highlighting the commitments to the country programme of UNDP and the government.

The 2006-2010 CPD/CPAP underwent a mid-term evaluation (MTR) in 2008, the results of which have contributed to the findings and recommendations of this evaluation. Further, the UNDP country programmes for the periods 2001-2005 and 2006-2010 were selected for an 'Assessment of Development Results' (ADR) commissioned by the UNDP Evaluation Office in New York in 2009. The findings of the ADR have also substantively contributed to, and further validated, the findings and recommendations of this evaluation.

2.2 Methodology of the Evaluation

The methodology was based on both inductive and deductive approaches using quantitative and qualitative data gathered from a carefully selected range of sources.

- Desk Review
 - Identify the outcome baseline [in order to later determine the degree of change](#)
 - Obtain contextual information [in order to understand the development context, operating environment, challenges faced and opportunities to be taken advantage of](#)
 - Examine Project Documents, Country Programme Action Plan, Assessment of Development Results and UNPDF (UN Partnership for Development Framework) [to understand UNDP's contributions at the project, programme and UN Country Team level](#)

- Key Informant Interviews (list of individuals interviewed in Annex 3)
 - Validate information sourced through the desk review process
 - Probe the selected/proxy indicators

The evaluator prepared a questionnaire approved by UNDP Indonesia for use during interviews, and also surveyed stakeholders to quantify the degree of change in capacity of the government to address environment and climate change issues. The survey posed two questions to stakeholders using scales of 1-10 upon which to rate their responses. Based on the average response to each answer, the degree of change was then calculated by comparing the average of question 1 to that of question 2. Respondents were asked to justify their scoring so as to understand and substantiate the mean score. In general, changes in capacity can be grouped into five categories: awareness, policy/legislative; institutional; financial; and coordination.

- Analysis of Information

Based on the desk review data, information obtained during the stakeholder interview process and data provided through external publications, an analysis of information was undertaken to determine the following:

 - Constructive critique of the outcome formulation
 - Coherence of the UNDP strategy and management focusing on change at the outcome level
 - The alignment of UNDP planning and management in contributing to outcomes
 - The effectiveness of individual outputs (if any) in contributing to outcomes
 - How the outcome has been influenced, including major contributing factors
 - Local sources of knowledge
 - Resolve issue of UNDP having an unintended effect or not having intended effect
 - Evaluate the partnership strategy

- Submission of a Draft Evaluation Report

- Revision of Draft Evaluation Report based on input from UNDP and submission of Final Report

2.3 Limitations of the Evaluation

There were a number of limitations affecting the implementation of this outcome evaluation. The evaluator has therefore aimed to deliver a report that draws on available resources, both primary and secondary, to present findings and recommendations which are concise, concrete and provide strategic options for UNDP Indonesia as it initiates its 2011-2015 Country Programme Action Plan.

- a. *Time frame.* This evaluation was undertaken within a short time frame of 14 working days, with four working days allocated for interviews with UNDP and national level stakeholders. This limited the number of stakeholders who could be interviewed due to their availability as well as time constraints in reaching all of the stakeholders available within the limited time. The evaluator was reliant on the UNDP Environment Team to determine the most strategic individuals to be interviewed based on the list of requested interviews submitted by the evaluator.
- b. *Availability of outcome and output monitoring data.* UNDP has been candid regarding the lack of results-based and evidence based monitoring data at the outcome level. Prior to 2011, UNDP Indonesia monitored at the CPAP output level, but not at the outcome level. Moreover, the quality of monitoring data, and irregularity of data collection, at the output level, has presented

difficulties in determining evidence-based links between UNDP's project-based inputs and change at the outcome level. The evaluator has therefore relied heavily on the monitoring data provided in the MDG Reports, the ADR, and situational analysis of the CPAP 2011-2015, supplemented by information and inputs provided by government stakeholders.

- c. *Availability of stakeholders (other agencies) and data on their programmes and activities.* Despite efforts to arrange interviews and to obtain inputs through alternate avenues (email, Skype), the evaluator has been unable to obtain inputs from other development partners, including other UN Agencies participating in joint programming, regarding their opinions on the UNDP environment programme, contribution to any change in the outcome, as well as to obtain information regarding their own programmes and activities.

3. The Development Context

3.1 Overview of historical trends and development challenges

As noted in the previous section, UNDP Indonesia commissioned a Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the 2006-2010 CPAP in 2008, and underwent an 'Assessment of Development Results' (ADR) commissioned by the UNDP Evaluation Office in New York in 2009. UNDP also published the policy document 'The Other Half of Climate Change' in 2007. As such, substantive analysis of the development trends and challenges in the field of environment has already been undertaken, and this evaluation draws on those analyses for the purposes of efficiency and consistency.

The CPAP MTR noted that the impact of climate change is already being felt by many Indonesians through longer dry seasons, more erratic rainfall, rising sea levels and more frequent flooding. This was further confirmed by the findings of the ADR which noted that the irreversible environmental changes are altering development trends: sea-level rise combined with land subsidence and environmental degradation is leading to more flooding and inundation of settlements, severely impacting urban livelihoods, particularly in slum areas (which are predominantly in coastal areas of Indonesia's largest cities). Higher temperatures are also being recorded, and these impacts are weighing most heavily on the poor. Improved environmental management in rural areas requires addressing weaknesses in rule of law (particularly land use rights and land titling) as well as strengthening the capacity of all levels of government and communities to implement environmental laws and regulations.

Further, Indonesia is a significant contributor to global warming, which plays a role in accelerating climate change. Deforestation and peatland degradation are substantial and need to be reduced. Emissions from the energy sector are growing rapidly, while emissions from other sectors remain modest but the exact level of household (burning of waste) and agriculture (burning of rice straw) emissions remains unclear. [These assessments imply that the programme was not on-track to meet the outcome target as explicitly stated in the CPAP 2006-2010.](#)

Despite these challenges, the Government of Indonesia has committed to address environmental degradation and reduce its contributions to global warming. Indonesia ratified the Montreal Protocol and Vienna Convention in 1992 and formulated its Country Programme in 1994. In 1998, Government of Indonesia started the process of preparing for the phase-out of Ozone-depleting Substances (ODS) under the Montreal Protocol. The action plan proposed to address each of the ODS consuming industry sectors, through six elements, namely, institutional measures, regulatory measures, incentive and disincentive measures, awareness and information dissemination, investment and technical assistance and monitoring. Complete ODS phase-out was targeted ambitiously for 1998. The Government initiated preparation of the Country Programme Update in 1998 with the assistance of the World Bank, UNDP and the industry, under which, the ODS consuming sectors were resurveyed. The updated country programme renewed and reinforced Indonesia's commitment, strategy and action plans to eliminate ODS and is intended to serve as a guideline for future activities related to meeting Indonesia's obligations under the Montreal Protocol. Realizing the needs of the industry and the economy, the updated Country Programme revised the target date for complete ODS phase-out for end-2007.

The Ministry of Environment (MoE) is responsible for coordinating, supervising and monitoring the ODS phase-out programme in compliance with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol while at the same time is responsible for the administration, monitoring and enforcement of national legislation, namely the Environmental Management Act (No 23/1997) and its subsidiary regulations. The MoE

was hard pressed by the ever growing workload including the rapid growth of ODS related matters while the government resources allocated for the activities was rather limited.

The legislative framework has also taken shape, with a number of laws passed, including:

- Law on the Environment (No 23/1997)
- Law on Toxic Waste (1997)
- Basic Forestry Law (No 41/1999)
- Law on Fisheries (No 31/2004)

Other legislation passed during the implementation of the CPAP includes:

- Law on Marine and Coastal Resources (2007)
- Law on Energy (2007)
- Law on Mining (2009)
- Law on Management of Water Resources (date not known)

However, it was noted in the World Bank's 2009 Country Environment Assessment that this legislation¹ lacks a common vision or coherency, and is often overlapping and contradictory, which is further exacerbated by the interpretations of this legislation, and competing priorities, at the local level.

A number of sectors in Indonesia began to give special attention to the climate hazards as environmentally-related events tended to increase and cause serious damage to life and property and economic losses. Key sectoral policies developed, or under development include: forestry, biodiversity, fisheries, transport and energy, and education. A number of divisions to tackle climate problems in sectors were established as a result, formed to assist the sectors to properly manage the current climate risks, for example in the Directorate of Plant Protection under the Ministry of Agriculture has established a division dealing with climate hazards.

A number of adaptation studies have been implemented in Indonesia. However, much work on adaptation has been based primarily on projections of climate change impacts 50-100 years from now, while policy makers face climate risks at seasonal, annual, decadal, and multi-decadal timescales. Therefore, they become less attractive for policy makers. On the other hand, during the development of National Action Plan on Climate Change (MoE, 1999), the involvement of sectors was very limited. Consequently, these sectors failed to mainstream climate change concerns into sectoral and national development priorities.

After the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and the formation of the designated national authority for clean development mechanism (CDM), the concern of sectors, particularly energy and forestry sectors, to greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation programs increased considerably, but interest in adaptation issues remained low. At the local level, the concern regarding climate change mitigation was not clearly seen. Participation of local stakeholders in mitigation programs is still low.

To accelerate the process of streamlining climate change into the development planning processes, the Government of Indonesia through the Ministry of Environment is prepared the Government Regulation on Managing Climate Change Impact. This regulation was expected to be effective in early 2007.

¹ Country Environment Assessment, World Bank 2009

Related to UNDP's sector specific support, the following outlines the development context in the energy and natural resource management sectors.

The Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME) completed a Master Plan in 1995 for Energy Conservation. The plan included an import tax reduction on high-efficiency equipment and soft loans for companies implementing energy efficiency improvements. At the beginning of the CPAP cycle, Indonesia was in the process of drafting national standards for room air conditioners, electric water heaters, televisions and electric irons. However, progress on energy standards and labelling (ES&L) was very slow, and without assistance, efficiency levels were predicted to gradually increase under a Business-as-Usual (BAU) scenario, from 0.2 % to as high as 1% per year, depending on the product.

Microhydro resources in Indonesia are abundant and remained largely untapped. At the beginning of the CPAP cycle, the Government of Indonesia and the private sector had ongoing and planned renewable energy and rural electrification initiatives. Similarly, Microturbine Cogeneration Technology (MCT) is the best alternative option for a growing captive power market as it produces less GHG than that of the standard reciprocating or internal combustion engines, which are used in facilities that require both power and thermal energy. It is particularly appropriate in areas where gas resources are abundant or easy to get such as those served by natural gas reticulation systems. MCT systems are easy to operate and maintain, and can also be operated using biogas and commercially available liquid fuels. However, there are multiple barriers hindering the development an application of alternative and clean energy technologies, in general, and microhydro and MCT in particular, including market, policy, technical and financial barriers to microhydro and MCT development and utilization.

A major underlying cause of forest degradation is the inequitable distribution of benefits from forest resources and lack of coordination among stakeholders and sectors. There is a need to lift barriers to community-based forest and watershed management, including creating an enabling environment at the district, provincial and national levels. Previous efforts at forest and watershed management have taken place, but if they had not included the community (community-driven) they were not sustainable.

3.2 Response of the Government of Indonesia to environmental challenges

In the GoI 2005-2009 National Medium-Term Development Plan, the development policies were directed towards a balance between the management of natural resources and the environment, and their function as the capital of economic growth as a life support system, in order to guarantee the sustainability of the national development programme

The steps taken prior to the implementation of the 2005-2009 development plan, and to be taken during the five year government programme cycle included:

- Eradication of illegal logging in a number of regions in order to maintain the number of protected forests and conservation areas.
- Launching of the national movement of forest rehabilitation in order to rehabilitate critical areas
- Promoting an energy saving 'movement' and the use of alternative, efficient and environmentally-friendly energy, such as natural gas and bio-diesel
- Reducing ODS until it is completely phased out in 2010.²

² Indonesia MDG Report 2005

The CPAP MTR noted that, based on the above, the Government of Indonesia was demonstrating its resolve to take decisive action to adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change. However, measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change risks would require a paradigm shift, placing climate at the centre of development priorities. The ADR noted that it was only beginning in early 2007 that the GoI accelerated its response to climate change. In late 2007 the MoE launched the National Action Plan on Climate Change (RANPI). One of RANPI's key recommendations was the need to integrate climate change into national development planning. The GoI prepared 'Indonesia's National Development Planning Response to Climate Change' (the 'Yellow Book') which provides directions about Indonesia's most urgent priorities in terms of adaptation and mitigation, institutional arrangements and financing mechanisms, as well as established the National Climate Change Council in 2008/2009, to act as an advisory support mechanism for the government.

3.3 UNDP Responses

a. The UNDP Programme

The 2006-2010 CPAP outlines three strategic areas of intervention in support of the development challenges in the environment field, which align with the Government of Indonesia's environment priorities outlined in the 2005-2009 Medium-Term Development Plan:

- *Sound environmental management:* UNDP assistance aimed to explore complementary measures such as market-based and human rights-base approaches to help ensure fair and just access to natural resources and a healthy environment for the people, especially the poor. UNDP's aim was to strengthen inter-sectoral capacities to implement best practices in watershed protection, prevention of land degradation, and thus safeguard the sustainability of water resources, agricultural and fishery potentials, as well as the livelihoods of the people.
- *Effective use of energy resources:* UNDP assistance aimed to mobilise significant resources in order to develop sound policy, institutional capacity, technological transfer, and market development for renewable energy resources that aimed to reduce dependency on fossil fuels, improve energy efficiency and conservation, and contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). Assistance was aimed at leveraging the ability of the poor and rural communities to meet basic needs such as lighting, cooking and electronic appliances that would vitalise economic activities, and to enhance the delivery of public services such as education, health, communication and access to information.
- *Advocacy and capacity development to effectively adhere to international agreement instruments:* UNDP aimed to support the GoI in strengthening its capacity to adhere to obligations stated in the Rio Convention on biodiversity, global climate change diversification as well as other environment-related conventions such as the Montreal Protocol on ozone depleting substances and the Stockholm Convention on persistent organic pollutants. Increased national capacities in this respect would be instrumental to the successful achievement of the objectives set out in the other strategic areas of UNDP intervention.

b. The CPAP Results and Resources Framework 2006-2010 – Environment Outcome

CPAP Outcome	CPAP Output	Indicators/ Targets
--------------	-------------	---------------------

<p>By 2010, improved environmental living conditions and sustainable use of energy in Indonesia and establishment of sustainable living conditions in the targeted provinces in Indonesia</p> <p>Indicator: National MDGs analysis on overall reduction of environmental degradation rate across the various indicators utilised in the MDG Report</p>	<p>Comprehensive frameworks and effective action plans for regional environment management developed and implemented in priority districts and provinces with critical environment, natural resource management, and poverty reduction challenges that resulted in improved environmental quality and equitable access to natural resources among the poor, leading to improved local livelihoods</p>	<p>Indicators: Policy framework, institutional capacity, work programmes, and monitoring evaluation mechanism are in place and awareness and participation are raised to allow: equitable access to natural resources is opened to the populations; productive use of genetic resources; improved local environmental and ecological services</p> <p>Target: (Cumulative) 2010 in 20 districts and 3 provinces</p>
<p>Baseline: Downward Trend (see section on 'Baseline' below)</p> <p>Target: Upward Trend</p>	<p>Policy, regulatory, economic, market, technological and information barriers to the effective use of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures are removed, and resulted in optimized use of local energy resources; delivery of basic energy services to poor and remote communities, vitalized local economic activities, and reduced national greenhouse gases emission</p>	<p>Indicators: (i) Policy framework, institutional capacity, work programmes, and monitoring evaluation mechanism are in place and awareness and participation are raised to allow: productive use of local sustainable energy resources; and delivery of basic energy services to poor and remote populations. (ii) amount of greenhouse gas emission reduced</p> <p>Targets (cumulative): 2010 (i) 20 districts and 5 provinces; (ii) 800 kilo tons</p>
	<p>National capacities in adhering to the three Rio conventions, namely UNFCCC, UNDBD and UNCCD, as well as other environment related conventions improved</p>	<p>Indicators: (i) National Communication to the UNFCCC and NCSA; (ii) amount of ODS phased out (up to 2007), Ozone Layer Protection Programme in Local Government (iii) Status of Stockholm Convention and POPs phase out.</p> <p>Targets: 2010: (i) NCSA action plan institutionalized in 6 national institutions and action plan up scaled completed in 5 provinces; (ii) POPs phase out (iii) 20.000 mgTEQ</p>

c. Outcome Baseline

Outcome Indicator	MDG Indicator	2004 Data	Source
National MDGs analysis on overall	Proportion of forest area to land	63% Cause: illegal logging, bush fires, forest	Indonesia MDG Report 2005

reduction of environmental degradation rate across the various indicators utilised in the MDG Report		conversion for development activities (mining, road construction, settlement)	
	Ratio of conservation areas to the overall land	Increase from 2001-2004	Indonesia MDG Report 2005
	Ratio of energy usage per domestic product	Increase Cause: Energy usage not efficient, non-renewable energy resources limited	Indonesia MDG Report 2005
	Phase out of CFCs	CFCs banned in 1998, but enforcement of illegal import difficult given the geographical nature and size of Indonesia	Indonesia MDG Report 2005

The outcome indicator in the CPAP was deemed insufficient by this evaluator to assist in analysing the degree of change in relation to the outcome, as well as to be able to link UNDP contributions directly to any achievement of the outcome. As such, the evaluator has developed a **proxy indicator** based on the outcome statement, which facilitated the determination of the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of UNDP’s project-based and ‘soft’ assistance contributions:

- **Change in capacity of government to comply with international environmental conventions and respond to environment and climate change challenges**

The indicator will not be reported against specifically in the ‘Contributions to Results’ Section below, but has been used to guide the evaluation process, particularly in the development of the questionnaire and survey used during the field work component of the evaluation process. The proxy indicator was developed based on the desk review of UNDP project documents and baseline data, which indicated the varying levels of political will and government capacity to address the environment and climate change agendas. Political will, and capacity in particular, are drivers for improving the environment and effectively and sustainably addressing climate change. Further, capacity development is a niche area of UNDP. These factors determined that the proxy indicator above would be the most appropriate in guiding the evaluator to determine UNDP’s contributions.

d. UNDP Comparative Advantages

The 2006-2010 CPAP lays out UNDP’s comparative advantage as a development partner for the Government of Indonesia in addressing environmental and climate change challenges and implementing the government’s Medium-Term Development Plan:

*‘UNDP’s **advocacy and policy dialogue** role cuts across all focus areas of the Country Programme. In the environment field, for example, UNDP is helping to move Indonesia’s climate change agenda forward. This involves, inter alia, the publication of the report ‘The Other Half of Climate Change: Why Indonesia Must Adapt to Protect its Poorest People’ in 2007, which contributed to the climate change agenda, the preparation of the National Action Plan on Climate Change and now a programme to support the implementation of the Climate Change agenda. UNDP is also involved in strengthening the policy and regulatory framework for the implementation of international treaties, such as the Montreal Protocol or its assistance to the development of policies for environmentally strategic regions. The human development paradigm and MDGs provide the overall umbrella for UNDP’s advocacy efforts on poverty, gender, the environment, and development partnership.’³*

³ UNDP Indonesia CPAP 2006-2010

e. *UNDP main activities and challenges*

Data for this section is drawn from the findings of the ADR, as well as available project progress and final reports.

- *UNDP activities:*

UNDP’s activities contributed directly to the achievement or progress against MDG 7 indicators for Indonesia. The information below provides details on UNDP’s specific project-based inputs.

3.3.1.1.1.1 CPAP Output 2.1 (Sound Environmental Management): Comprehensive frameworks and effective action plans for regional environment management developed and implemented in priority districts and provinces with critical environment, natural resource management, and poverty reduction challenges that resulted in improved environmental quality and equitable access to natural resources among the poor, leading to improved local livelihoods

Partners as noted in the CPAP: BAPPENAS, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance; Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Public Works, National NGOs

Activities:

Project	Outputs
GEF SGP (GEF Small Grants Programme)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sustainable use of biodiversity established in production landscapes/seascapes through community-based conservation, innovative approaches and market mechanisms 2. Intensify the replication, scaling-up or mainstreaming of climate change mitigation barrier removal models that have been successfully tested and practically applied at the local level, in national development priorities and plans 3. Community-based Adaptation practices promoted and incorporated in national development priorities 4. Demonstration of community-based approaches for the implementation of SAPs and models replicated, scaled up and mainstreamed 5. Innovative and adaptive community-based approaches demonstrated, piloted and integrated into global efforts to address unsustainable agricultural practices, rangeland and forestry management while promoting local livelihoods
SCBFWM (Strengthening Community-based Forest and Watershed Management in Indonesia)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Six critical watersheds with diverse ecological and socio-economic conditions demonstrate improved management using CBFWM 2. Governmental agencies provide support to formulate to the development of CBFWM initiatives 3. Coordination among and between different levels of government generates consistent policies and programmes that support CBFWM
UN-REDD (United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in	<p>To support development of an Indonesian REDD architecture which is inclusive and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works on strengthening multi-stakeholder involvement at national and sub national levels while aligning sub national process to the national level, 2. Work son harmonizing the REDD supply chain with an emphasis on Reference Emission Level setting, Measurement Verification and Reporting (MRV) and

Developing Countries)	principles/standards for payment entitlement and; 3. Builds capacity within various agencies and stakeholders towards REDD implementation
-----------------------	--

3.3.1.1.1.2 **CPAP Output 2.2 (Effective Use of Energy Resources):** Policy, regulatory, economic, market, technological and information barriers to the effective use of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures are removed, and resulted in optimized use of local energy resources; delivery of basic energy services to poor and remote communities, vitalized local economic activities, and reduced national greenhouse gases emission

Partners as noted in the CPAP: BAPPENAS, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, BPPT, Ministry of Environment, National NGOs

Activities

Project	Outputs
BRESL (Barrier Removal To The Cost-Effective Development And Implementation Of Energy Efficiency Standards And Labelling Project)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of legal and regulatory basis for removing lowest EE technologies from the market and promoting high-efficiency technologies. 2. Building of institutional and individual capacity to secure on-the-ground implementation of regulatory frameworks, as well as actual standards and labelling programs. 3. Provision of information and technical assistance to manufacturers of covered products 4. Regional cooperation and information sharing on-going and helps to maximize impacts 5. Demonstration of various aspects of the development and implementation of ES&L programs
IMIDAP (Promoting Environmentally Sound and Renewable Energy Resources through: Integrated Microhydro Development and Application Program)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhanced private sector interest and involvement in the microhydro power business; 2. Increased number of community-based microhydro Programmes as a result of effective institutional capacity building 3. Improved availability, and local knowledge, of microhydro technology applications in potential areas of microhydro development; 4. Private sector and rural communities and implement microhydro Programmes for electricity and productive use purposes.
MCTAP (Microturbine Cogeneration Technology Application Project)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technology Assessment and MCT Application development Thorough understanding and appreciation of technology options and their environmental impacts of MCT systems by ICE sector, government and other stakeholders 2. Establishment of a critical mass of demonstration projects that will provide detailed information of MCT operations, energy savings and environmental impacts to enterprises interested MCT systems from ICE sectors 3. Availability of financial and institutional support to encourage enterprises from ICE sector to adopt energy efficient MCT systems 4. Promulgation of and compliance to regulations that encourage adoption of MCT systems 5. Enhanced awareness of the public and other stakeholders on the efficient use of MCT for EC&EE practices in ICE sectors 6. Improved local vocational, technical; and managerial capacity to manage and sustain operations of MCT for EC&EE practices in the ICE sectors.

3.3.1.1.1.3 **CPAP Output 2.3 (Advocacy and Capacity Development):** National capacities in adhering to the three Rio conventions, namely UNFCCC, UNDBD and UNCCD, as well as other environment-related conventions improved

Partners as noted in the CPAP: BAPPENAS, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Trade, Ministry of Industry, National NGOs

Activities

Project	Outputs
SNC (Enabling Activities for the Preparation of Indonesia's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National GHG Inventory 2. Programme for mitigation and adaptation 3. Communication materials produced and disseminated
IS4 (Extension of Institutional Strengthening: Phase 4)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effectively and efficiently phase out Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) through the adoption of policy, technological and monitoring measures in compliance with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol. Phase 4 of the project is aimed to further strengthen and enhance the capacity of the Ozone Unit to pursue with the national ozone layer protection and ODS phase-out programs.
RefManufacturing (Sector Phase-out Plan for Elimination of CFCs in the Refrigeration (Manufacturing) Sector in Indonesia)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To achieve complete phase-out of CFCs in the Refrigeration (manufacturing) Sector in Indonesia within five years. 2. To enable Indonesia to meet its obligations of phased ODS reductions in accordance with the control schedule of the Montreal Protocol. 3. To ensure timely, sustainable and cost-effective CFC phase-out in the Refrigeration (manufacturing) Sector, through development and implementation of a combination of investment, technical support and policy/management support components.
RefServicing (Phase-out Management Plan for CFCs in the Refrigeration (Servicing) Sector in Indonesia)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Together with the Refrigeration (Manufacturing) Sector Phase-out Plan to achieve complete phase-out of CFCs in the Refrigeration Sector in Indonesia within five years by implementing the phase-out management plan for CFCs in the Refrigeration (Servicing) Sector. 2. To enable Indonesia to meet its obligations of phased ODS reductions in accordance with the control schedule of the Montreal Protocol. 3. To ensure timely, sustainable and cost-effective CFC phase-out in the Refrigeration (Servicing) Sector, through development and implementation of a combination of investment, technical support and policy/management support components.

- *Challenges*

The Indonesia MDG Report 2005 lays out four key challenges for sustainable development, and by extension, challenges which the UNDP programme should contribute to overcoming:

- **Economic recovery** was expected to improve the economy of one-third of the population in forest conservation areas so that illegal cutting could be reduced. However, economic development still ranks as a top priority for the government, and the government has yet to determine how to develop policies which are good for both the economy and the environment – the government is not yet ready to make industry sacrifice;
- **Decentralisation** was expected to give an opportunity for the restoration of natural resources, conservation and efficiency but also posed(s) risks for biodiversity which may be regarded as a source of regional governments' revenue, as well as subject to the lack of capacity to implement environment and natural resource management programmes and enforce regulation;

- **Good governance** should support sustainable development programmes and address issues of anti-corruption, accountability and transparency;
- **Globalisation** offers an opportunity for sustainable development, through south-south cooperation, technology and information transfer/exchange.⁴

⁴ Indonesia MDG Report 2005

4. Findings and Conclusions

This section of the evaluation will address the four main objectives as outlined in Section 1 of this report. Using the OECD DAC criteria as a guide, this section addresses the status of the outcome, including factors which are affecting the outcome; UNDP's contribution, including its *approach* to partnerships. While ideally this section of the report would be broken down into four sub-sections (status, factors, UNDP contributions, partnerships), based on the results of the document review and interviews with stakeholders, the presentation of the findings according to the below sub-sections provides a more coherent assessment of the outcome and the lessons to be extracted for on-going and future programming.

4.1 Relevance (of UNDP's involvement and its approach)

The UNDP 2006-2010 environment programme **was aligned with the national priorities** for environment and sustainable development, and was viewed by government stakeholders as critical as it strategically targeted sectors which allowed the Government to gain momentum in addressing environment and climate change challenges. This was particularly the case following the 2007 UN Climate Change Conference in Bali (13th Conference of Parties – COP 13). Numerous stakeholders noted that the COP 13 was a catalyst which energized the government to address climate change and the environment in a more concerted and coordinated manner. While the specific programme of UNDP as outlined in the CPAP was sectorally focused, working with government to access financing for community-level demonstration projects and sector specific issues, and was marginally criticised in the ADR 2010 for its small size and scope in comparison to the growing environment agenda, and financing options, in Indonesia, the work done in the initial three years of the CPAP (2006-2008) strategically placed UNDP as a preferred, neutral partner for the government to support the scale up of programming (including the implementation and enforcement of legislation) from 2008 on-wards. This is reflected in UNDP's CPAP 2011-2015, which notes and environment outcome 2.1 of *'Responsible national institutions and relevant stakeholders are more effective in managing environmental resources and addressing environmental pollution.'* The outcome statement reflects the growing ownership of the government to drive the environment and climate change agenda, and capitalising on UNDP's strengths and role in assisting the government to access financing and promote capacity development for environmental management.

A key issue which is lacking in the UNDP programme is a specific mention of how the programme will target men and women, and is only tangentially referenced in the CPAP 2011-2015. While individual projects, such as the SGP-GEF and SCBFWM projects have promoted and targeted women's and indigenous groups for inclusion in activities and grants, the overall programme and contributions of UNDP at the outcome level fall short of UNDP's global commitment to mainstream gender and human-rights based approaches into programming and policy work. Stakeholders noted that despite the extremely important role UNDP has played in information dissemination, awareness raising and policy advocacy, the issues of gender and human rights received little to no attention from the programme. However, it must be noted that the REDD+ programme has developed guidelines in 2010 for 'Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC)' which provides a mechanism for all REDD+ initiatives to consult with and include indigenous and poor communities in Indonesia which will participate in the initiatives. This is an important step towards ensuring that a human rights approach is mainstreamed at the strategic level and filters down to the community level, but needs to be expanded to include all UNDP initiatives, not only those covered through REDD+. Ground breaking as the FPIC is, there is no mention of it in the 2011-2015 CPAP.

Nonetheless, all government stakeholders noted that UNDP's role was critical in acting as a 'convener' – bringing together the various actors (governmental and non-governmental) to more coherently address climate change and environment. Prior to 2008, these issues were perceived to be the sole responsibility of the Ministry of Environment. However, following the COP 13, the importance of the involvement of and coordination between line ministries was increasingly recognized and acted upon. The government stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation were candid about the inability of the government agencies to constructively communicate and coordinate among themselves beyond the ministerial level. Numerous reasons were given for this, the leading one being that the ministries, while recognizing the importance of coordination and cooperation, were also in competition with one another for government funds. Regardless of the priority which the government put on environment in its Medium Term Development Plan 2005-2009, and the enthusiasm resulting from the COP 13, the capacity to coordinate at the central level was an acute impediment to the advance of the government's environmental agenda. The acknowledged role, and capacity of, UNDP in acting as a convener and facilitator among agencies has been noted as critical in the ability of the government to move its agenda forward. UNDP is regarded as a neutral partner which promotes the government as decision maker, and does not provide assistance tied to conditions, such as with the loans from the World Bank and Asian Development Bank. While it is very likely that the government would have eventually overcome its communication and coordination challenges, all stakeholders acknowledged that the UNDP assistance was a critical advantage in expediting the process, supplemented by the international knowledge and experiences upon which it could draw and share with the Indonesian government. One of the impacts of this was that environment and climate change were acknowledged as a key priority in the 2010-2015 Medium Term Development Plan, the foundations of which sit in the 'Yellow Book' and 'Sectoral Road Map' prepared by the GoI in 2008-2010.

The role of convener and facilitator of coordination by UNDP should be considered as its most relevant, and largest, contribution to the environment agenda in Indonesia. Unfortunately, this 'soft' assistance is reflected neither at the outcome nor output level within the 2006-2010 CPAP. As such, the substantial contribution of UNDP's 'soft' assistance would not factor into an evaluation which focused solely on the outcome and output indicators developed, and therefore affect the ability to evaluate the achievement of the outcome. It is noted, however, that UNDP has put somewhat more emphasis on its non-project contributions in the 2011-2015 CPAP, although the monitoring tools to reflect these contributions remain weak.

Therefore, UNDP needs to build upon the advancements made with its 'soft' assistance, and should strategically focus its 2011-2015 CPAP to the vocalised needs of the government: capacity building for the implementation of policy, legislation and planning at the central and local levels, which includes the clarification of roles and responsibilities between central and local government for environment and climate change programming.

4.2 Effectiveness (in contributing to the achievement of outcomes)

Extent to which outcomes progress towards outcome achievement has been made

As noted above, a substantial portion of UNDP's work in the environment sector has come in the form of 'soft' assistance. As such, if this evaluation were to focus solely on the change denoted through outcome indicator data, it would be difficult to note substantial change, and determine whether or not the outcome has been achieved. This is in large part due to the indicators used to measure the achievement of the outcome. Evaluated against the data provided in the MDG Report 2010, there is little change, and in some instances, there is a negative trend.

Outcome Indicator	MDG Indicators	2004 Data	2010 Data
National MDGs analysis on overall reduction of environmental degradation rate across the various indicators utilised in the MDG Report	Proportion of forest area to land	63% Cause: illegal logging, bush fires, forest conversion for development activities (mining, road construction, settlement)	52% (2008)
	Ratio of conservation areas to the overall land	Increase from 2001-2004	Data not provided
Baseline : Downward trend	Ratio of energy usage per domestic product	Increase Cause: Energy usage not efficient, non-renewable energy resources limited	Decreasing Cause: use of non-renewable energy sources doubled between 1990-2008
Target : Reverse Trend	Phase out of CFCs	CFCs banned in 1998, but enforcement of illegal import difficult given the geographical nature and size of Indonesia	CFCs reduced to a minimal level – less than 100 tonnes (2007), but still dealing with the illegal import of ODS

While UNDP activities have directly supported the achievement of targets for MDG 7 indicators on energy use and the phase out of CFCs, the outcome and indicator do not reflect critical processes which have been initiated through UNDP support. Thus it would be impossible to determine whether or not UNDP support has contributed in any way, either positively or negatively, to the achievement or progress towards the overall outcome. As such, the effectiveness of UNDP contributions will examine the CPAP outputs as well as UNDP's 'soft' assistance using the proxy indicator.

Affect and effectiveness of UNDP's corresponding outputs towards the outcome

One of the key contributions of UNDP across all outputs has been its ability to use its own funding (TRAC funds) to initiate demonstration projects which have then been used to leverage additional financing from global resources and the GoI. These demonstration projects have brought to the attention of the GoI the importance of investing in projects for energy efficiency, renewable energy, ODS reduction, and forest and water shed management. The positive results of these projects have generally resulted in UNDP:GoI cost-sharing in the range of USD 1:USD 20-25. Thus, while both the CPAP MTR and ADR noted that UNDP's environment projects tended to be limited in number and size in comparison with the funding availability and the importance placed on the environment agenda, the contributions of UNDP at the output level, particularly in energy efficiency/renewable energy and in community-based natural resource management have ensured that these issues have been adopted by the GoI as priority areas for programming in the coming five years. However, a key gap, noted by both UNDP and GoI stakeholders, is that the lessons from the demonstration projects are not feeding into the policy and planning processes at the national level. While the individual projects deal with community and geographic specific issues and challenges, overarching lessons need to be better fed through into the strategic planning and legislative processes. This is one area where UNDP admits to a weakness within the environment team, but which should form a substantive part of its 'soft' assistance in the 2011-2015 UNDP programme cycle. Lessons from conflict prevention (Peace Through Development), disaster risk reduction (Safer Communities Through Disaster Risk Reduction in Development) and recovery (Disaster Risk Reduction-guided Rehabilitation and Reconstruction) programmes within UNDP Indonesia on feeding project based lessons into national policy and planning should be adopted by the UNDP Indonesia environment team.

Effectiveness of UNDP partnerships in contributing to the outcome

With respect to **UNDP's partnership strategy**, if this aspect of UNDP's work was to be evaluated from a classical perspective of partnerships with other development agencies, civil society and the private sector, the actual contribution of 'partnerships' towards the outcome would be minimal. As noted by UNDP, and inferred by the evaluator from the lack of response to requests for information and meetings from other agencies, classical partnerships in Indonesia are fraught with competition over resources and jealousies of relationships with government. When asked about the government's work with other agencies, responses from government stakeholders ranged from 'ad hoc approaches,' to 'mistrust,' to 'unprofessional interactions.' **UNDP was consistently noted as a preferred partner for the government.**

This aligns with UNDP's stated approach towards partnerships for the environment programme. Given the nature of inter-agency relationships, noted above, **UNDP's partnership strategy was to facilitate and build partnerships between government agencies, and between government agencies and non-governmental actors (civil society, private sector, police), viewed by UNDP as the most effective way to move the environment agenda forward. Furthermore, as a result of UNDP's approach (NIM, grants), the government views UNDP as a neutral, trustworthy partner lacking a hidden agenda.** These combined approaches (implementation modality and 'partnership' facilitation) has allowed the government to fast track their environment agenda (compared to the pace it would advance without UNDP's facilitation) and to leverage international funds (including through a Letter of Intent with the Government of Norway for USD 1 billion in 2010) which will facilitate the implementation of environment sustainability and climate change adaptation/mitigation programming over the coming five years. The facilitation of partnerships has also resulted in the establishment of the Indonesia Climate Change Trust Fund (ICCTF) and UNREDD, which will initially leverage bilateral funding, but increasingly will target private sector funding, for the implementation of multi-sectoral initiatives which have developed as a result of improved coordination and cooperation between agencies. These improved capacities and additional financing options have substantively contributed to the progress towards the outcome, and through their institutionalisation, will be sustainable and continue to contribute towards UNDP's environment outcomes from 2011-2015.

A critical issue highlighted by government stakeholders was the need to improve UNDP's internal advisory capacity which can be accessed by the government on emerging issues resulting from the acceleration of the environment agenda implementation. It was also noted that UNDP's approach to capacity building (capacity development) needs to be more coherent. This would suggest that UNDP needs to examine its internal capacities in order to ensure that it can sustain its role as a preferred partner of the government and augment this position to continue to provide timely, relevant strategic and policy advice as the need arises. This is also true for issues of gender mainstreaming. Further, given the success of the implementation at the central and provincial levels of the 'capacity needs assessment' methodology within the disaster risk reduction and governance programmes, UNDP should also consider capitalising on these experiences and the requests by the government for UNDP to scale up its support to address government capacity to implement and monitor environment and climate change programmes.

Extent to which the outcomes benefitted women and men equally

Given that the outcome and output statements and indicators did not allow for gender disaggregated data, it was difficult for this evaluation to determine what, if any benefit UNDP's

contributions had from a gender perspective. As noted above, the lack of gender 'anything' during the implementation of the programme has resulted in a gap in knowledge, awareness and capacity within the government to mainstream gender within policy, legislation, planning and programmes. Therefore, gender mainstreaming should be a critical priority of UNDP in the 2011-2015 programme cycle.

Degree of change at the outcome level

In an attempt to quantify the degree of change, the evaluator asked stakeholders to rank the capacity of government to address environment and climate changes issues on a scale of 1-10 (1 very poor/non-existent; 10 very good). The question was asked regarding (central) government capacity in 2006, and again in 2010. The questions were posed to eight stakeholders.

While individual responses varied, the average score for 2006 was 4.25 out of 10. The average score for 2010 was 6.85 out of 10.

Respondents were asked to justify their scoring so as to understand and substantiate the mean score. In general, changes in capacity can be grouped into five categories: awareness, policy/legislative; institutional; financial; and coordination.

Awareness: Overall, stakeholders felt that government's understanding and awareness of climate change, the impacts and the need for a multi-sectoral approach has substantially improved. These changes have largely been attributed to the rise of international and local criticism of the government's response to climate change, the COP 13 in Bali which put the spotlight on Indonesia and its role in contributing to and combating climate change, and the dramatic weather and natural disasters in 2009 and 2010. UNDP's role in information dissemination and advocacy was highlighted as a key contributing factor to the increase in capacity on this issue.

Policy/Legislative: Stakeholders felt that the government's capacity to draft policy and legislation in response to the climate change discussion and spotlight on environmental issues has dramatically increased. Moreover, policy and legislation is taking a multi-sectoral approach, which means its implementation will have a far reaching impact. UNDP was credited specifically for its contribution to this change from its facilitation for policy dialogue, coordination, and advisory support – bringing in international experiences to ensure alignment with international environment legislation.

Institutional: While still weak, it was noted that institutional capacity is improving with the establishment of the National Climate Change Council (2008), and departments within all sectoral ministries to deal with climate change vulnerability. While advisory capacities are adequate, it was felt that in general, the staff of these departments needs strengthening on environment and climate change knowledge – at all levels. The decentralised nature of Indonesian government has meant that to date, most capacity and knowledge rests at the central government level, although environment programmes are implemented at the local level, which is plagued with lower quality education among civil servants, very high levels of staff turnover, and competing priorities for a smaller budget.

Financial: Overall, the government has increased budget allocations for environment and climate change programming. For example, the Ministry of Environment has received a 100% increase over the past five years, although this amount is still minimal compared to other ministries (accounting for only 2% of GDP). Further, with UNDP support the government has dramatically increased its capacity to tap financing resources (for example in the energy sector) from such funds as the GEF.

UNDP support was critical in allowing the government to plan, apply and report against projects which were aligned with government priorities. This capacity has now leveraged a dramatic increase in bilateral funding through the ICCTF and UNREDD, as well as through the Letter of Intent with the Norwegian Government.

Coordination: The key area where government capacity has notably improved is in coordination between the Ministry of Environment, line ministries and sectoral agencies. Prior to the COP 13, the Ministry of Environment was attempting to 'work alone': there was no coordination with other sectors. Although challenges still remain (fears of accusations of corruption which could arise through mistakes made in cross-sectoral programme implementation), UNDP has been directly credited with facilitating this inter-ministerial coordination, disseminating information and advocacy which resulted in quicker decision-making, and more transparent decision making processes – particularly the participation of non-governmental actors in the decision making process. As such, there is more ownership of policies and agendas by civil society and the private sector.

There was one detracting opinion, where the stakeholder felt that there had been no change in the government's capacity to address environment and climate change issues because it continued to lack a clear direction to overcome environmental problems: even though policies are in place, execution is not being undertaken by line ministries. This opinion is consistent with findings in the World Bank Country Environment Analysis 2009 (see above, Development Context) which notes that legislation lacks a common vision and coherency, resulting in often overlapping and contradictory laws and policies.

Nonetheless, while change against the stated outcome has been nominal against the indicator criteria outlined in the CPAP, change in the capacity of the (central) government to address environment and climate change issues has markedly improved, for which UNDP can be credited with substantive contributions particularly in the awareness, policy, financial and coordination capacities. These changes contribute to the sustainability and acceleration of the environment agenda, and to the achievement of the environment outcomes in the 2011-2015 CPAP.

4.3 Efficiency (in delivering outputs)

A key indicator of the **efficiency** of the environment programme is the ability of the team to work with the government to **secure cost-sharing for project implementation**. With limited TRAC resources, UNDP has been able to demonstrate with the government the need for projects to address issues such as energy efficiency, renewable energy and forestry and watershed management, and to bring other stakeholders 'on-board'. As noted above, cost sharing between UNDP and the Government is in the range of USD 1:USD 20-25. This demonstrates an efficient use of limited resources to leverage substantial government funds. The results of the demonstration projects and the strong, trustful relationship between UNDP and the Government have translated into the development of large financing facilities (ICCTF and UNREDD) through which bilateral donors are increasing contributing over the past two years.

However, efficiency was compromised due to the imbalance of administrative and technical responsibilities on programme staff. Procurement processes were often delayed, and processes that required approval from UNDP HQ took substantially longer, impacting on the time frame for project implementation, as well as motivation within the projects. However, it should be noted that in 2010 UNDP Indonesia initiated a change management process which realigns administrative and technical responsibilities for programme implementation between operations and programme staff. While

this process is still ongoing, it should result in a more streamlined implementation process which *should* improve the timeliness of UNDP project implementation.

The UNDP programme was also negatively impacted by poor monitoring and reporting at both the project and programme level. UNDP Indonesia only introduced standardised monitoring, evaluation and reporting [at the project level](#) in early 2010, too late to generate results-based monitoring reports for the CPAP period under evaluation. [Although UNDP has a process for monitoring projects through its ATLAS Project Management Module, it was utilised only to update project risks and issues and not to track project outputs.](#) As such, the programme team had noted that understanding the challenges, lessons and being able to scale up successful initiatives has thus been limited. Moreover, the weak monitoring tools outlined in the CPAP (outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets), and to which project monitoring frameworks were not aligned, has meant no evidence-based data has been collected to determine – concretely – the contribution of the projects to the outcome. [UNDP Indonesia was using a ‘traffic light’ system \(green: on track; yellow: slightly off track; red: off track\) to monitor at the CPAP output level on an \(semi\)annual basis, but this system did not have criteria which allowed the objective determination of green, yellow or red.](#) However, it should be noted that for the first half of the CPAP cycle, the UNDP Country Office was operating in an emergency phase in response to the Indian Ocean tsunami of December 2004 which devastated Aceh, the March 2005 earthquake in Nias and the May 2006 earthquake in Central Java and Jogjakarta. The emergency response and recovery programmes demanded nearly all of the resources of the country office for a significant period of time, detracting from its efforts effectively monitor CPAP outputs and outcomes.

However, UNDP Indonesia is now enforcing a standardised project document template, monitoring framework, rigorous assessment of project indicators and targets and alignment with CPAP outcome indicators, and has put in place Outcome Boards (similar to Project Boards) to oversee and guide the implementation of individual CPAP outcomes. This will allow for more regularised evaluation and reporting on outcome progress, which will positively contribute to UNDP’s ability to adjust its programme to the changing development environment as and when the need arises.

4.4 Sustainability (of the outcome)

The ADR outlines important results of the environment programme, and highlights their sustainability:

‘The projects in this programme were designed to address long term issues and many were developed with the GOI to ensure ownership. In general, UNDP has succeeded in building [sustainable national capacity, enabling environment and individual capacities](#) in energy and environment. The projects under review have set into law approaches that contribute to a healthier environment, and most of the local governments and related agencies now possess sufficient capacity to implement ODS regulations. The Ministry of Environment is capable of enforcing the ban on CFC imports. UNDP has also contributed towards the removal of barriers against locally produces sustainable energy/electricity. However there were instances where sustainability of capacity development efforts were questioned, particularly when UNDP brought in foreign consultants who took the capacity with them when they left.’

This evaluation notes that the sustainability of capacity development remains a critical issue, and should be a centre point of the 2011-2015 CPAP. With UNDP support, the awareness of environmental and climate change issues has noticeably improved, and with it critical improvements in coordination, communication and planning across sectors. However, without adequate

implementation capacity – at both the central and local levels (where implementation and enforcement will primarily take place) the momentum gained in addressing the environment agenda risks losing ground, and advances made by the government to address critical issues in the fields of energy, forestry, marine conservation and GHG reduction could back slide. Moreover, the 2006-2010 CPAP does little in the way of addressing issues of corruption within the natural resources management sector – although anti-corruption is a cross-cutting issue within the UNDP Indonesia Democratic Governance programme. Corruption, together with decentralisation, will be the biggest stumbling blocks for the implementation of environment and climate change adaptation/mitigation programmes in the coming five to ten years. This denotes a critical need for UNDP Indonesia to ensure cross-programme interaction and implementation as Indonesia's development challenges increasingly overlap across sectors.

However, despite some criticisms of the policy and legislative frameworks, Indonesia has made great strides in putting in place an enabling environment, and sourcing the necessary financing for its implementation, that the outlook for the sustainability of the results to date is positive. Nonetheless, key challenges remain, including clarifying the roles and responsibilities between central and local governments on implementation, building capacity for implementation, and ironing out any overlaps or contradictions within the legislative framework.

Finally, while this evaluation found minimal evidence of efforts by UNDP to advocate for and support the mainstreaming of gender and human rights based approaches at both project and programme levels, the evaluation also noted that there is a window of opportunity to work with the government as it moves forward in the implementation of its various sectoral programmes to support issues such as gender-based budgeting, monitoring, reporting and awareness raising. UNDP is in a position to increase its role and influence with the government, and in light of the fact that multi-lateral and bilateral funding for development programmes are in general tied to gender and human rights indicators, UNDP should capitalise on this situation in order to make up for lost opportunities during the 2006-2010 CPAP period.

5. Recommendations of the Evaluation

Overall, this evaluation finds that, although UNDP contributions to the stated outcome are limited, and change at the outcome level (against the outcome indicators) is limited, UNDP's role has been critical in the prioritisation, acceleration and sustainability of the environment agenda in Indonesia which has resulted in its, and laying the ground for a more strategic and proactive programme for the 2011-2015 period.

Therefore, *based on the above findings and lessons*, this evaluation provides the following recommendations to UNDP to assist in the revision or refinement of its 2011-2015 CPAP in order to ensure that it builds on its comparative advantages in the areas of facilitation, capacity building and cross-cutting issues such as gender, human rights, and governance, and is able to monitor those contributions at both the project and programmatic levels.

Recommendation 1. *Revise the environment component of the 2011-2015 CPAP in order to ensure that the focus of UNDP strategic support builds on its contributions and successes of the 2006-2010 CPAP, and that critical areas of UNDP's mandate are mainstreamed, monitored and evaluated.*

While the CPAP 2011-2015 design has included an outcome in the environment component focussing on government and stakeholders' capacity to effectively manage environment resources and address climate change; *the CPAP does not highlight the comparative strengths of UNDP which have emerged over the past five years.* As such, the environment component should focus its outcomes and outputs on the UNDP strengths within its areas of expertise (policy/legislation; renewable energy and energy efficiency; and climate change adaptation and mitigation). This will allow UNDP to have a CPAP which encompasses both 'soft' and project-based assistance.

The cross-cutting issues which need to be highlighted in the outcomes and outputs should focus on *capacity development* (central and local government levels) for the implementation of environment and climate change programmes; addressing the challenges of decentralised governance – specifically supporting the clarification of roles and responsibilities between central and local government for programme implementation, and facilitating central-local relationships (coordination and cooperation) based on its experiences facilitating relationships at the central level; working with government to address issues of corruption in the natural resources and climate change mitigation sectors in particular, through awareness raising and supporting anti-corruption initiatives; and mainstreaming gender and human rights based approaches within policy and legislation as well as project implementation at both the central and local levels.

Importantly, the CPAP monitoring tools need to be able to reflect UNDP's contributions to these cross-cutting issues, and focus less on technical indicators such as the reduction of GHGs, for example. The indicators and targets need to reflect what is possible and practical in the five year programme period.

Recommendation 2. *Focus UNDP's internal capacity development and learning on strategic processes which the government has highlighted as areas where UNDP's support is urgently required in order to maximise the impacts of environment and climate change programmes.*

Government stakeholders remarked that it is 'time' for UNDP *to scale up its role and contributions* to the environment agenda in Indonesia, beyond its role as convenor and implementer of demonstration projects. Given the quantity of financial resources now available for environment and climate change initiatives, this is an appropriate request. However, UNDP's role and contributions

will be impeded if it does not systematically focus on **internal capacities** where it has already noted it is lacking.

Primarily, UNDP needs to focus on its **in-house advisory capacity** to be able to rapidly respond to requests for support from the government in the evolving development environment. Given the resources available to UNDP, the recruitment of **senior climate change and energy efficiency advisors** would further consolidate UNDP's position as a preferred partner of the government. Given that the government has intimated during this evaluation that there is a lot to learn from within Indonesia, these advisors should be national posts, which also aligns with the Jakarta Commitments and the building of national capacity.

Secondly, the UNDP environment team needs to substantially increase its **capacity to facilitate the linking of project-based lessons with national policy and planning processes**. Numerous examples of such initiatives exist within the DRR and conflict prevention programmes within UNDP Indonesia, and cross-unit learning and collaboration (including for governance and gender/human rights related issues) can be an efficient use of internal resources, and add value to the environment programme.

Finally, the UNDP environment programme team needs to focus its work on **quality assurance** rather than on project implementation. A critical issue during this evaluation was the lack of objective monitoring data, project evaluations and reviews. The programme team needs to be able to link projects together for knowledge sharing and strategic planning purposes, and facilitate adjustments and changes within the programme based on project monitoring findings as the need arises. This will ensure that UNDP's projects and programme remain relevant, and are able to provide strategic contributions at the output and outcome level.

Annex 1 - Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNDP Indonesia –Sustainable environment and effective use of energy

Outcome Evaluation

I. INTRODUCTION

As one of the key international development partners in the country, UNDP is challenged to prove that its development programmes are contributing to the country's development achievements, specifically to point out how those effective and well-managed UNDP's projects were able to contribute to the improvement of people's lives in the country.

The growing demand for development effectiveness is largely based on the realization that producing good deliverables is simply not enough. Efficient or well-managed development projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no discernible improvements in development conditions and ultimately in people's lives. Being a key international development agency, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been increasing its focus on achievement of clearly stated results.

In keeping with the shift in focus from outputs to outcomes, UNDP has shifted from traditional project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to results-oriented M&E, especially outcome monitoring and evaluation that cover a set of related projects, programmes and partnership strategies intended to bring about a higher level outcome. To clearly identify how UNDP Country Programme contributes to the development results of the country, it is required to undertake a systematic outcome evaluation exercise. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in a given country context, and the role that UNDP has played. Outcome evaluations also help to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, highlight unintended consequences (positive and negative), recommend actions to improve performance in future programming and partnership building, and generate lessons learned.

II. OUTCOME TO BE EVALUATED

CPAP Outcome #2: By 2010, improved environmental living conditions and sustainable use of energy in Indonesia and establishment of sustainable living conditions in the targeted provinces in Indonesia (for detail see CPAP 2006-2010 document)

The main outputs contributing to the achievements of the outcome are:

- Comprehensive frameworks and effective action plans for regional environment management developed and implemented in priority districts and provinces with critical environment, natural resource management, and poverty reduction challenges that resulted in improved environmental quality and equitable access to natural resources among the poor, leading to improved local livelihoods.
- Policy, regulatory, economic, market, technological and information barriers to the effective use of renewable energy and energy efficiency measures are removed, and resulted in optimized use of local energy resources; delivery of basic energy services to poor and remote communities, vitalized local economic activities, and reduced national greenhouse gases emission
- National capacities in adhering to the three Rio conventions, namely UNFCCC, UNDBD and UNCCD, as well as other environment related conventions improved

III. CONCEPT and OBJECTIVES OF THE OUTCOME EVALUATION

Outcome evaluations move away from the old approach of assessing project results against project objectives towards an assessment of how these results contribute, together with the assistance of partners, to a change in development conditions. Outcomes are influenced by the full range of UNDP activities — projects, programmes, nonproject activities and "soft" assistance within and outside of projects. Outcomes are also influenced by the activities of other development actors.

The standard objectives of an outcome evaluation are to extract lessons learned, findings and recommendations. More specifically, the **four standard objectives of an outcome evaluation** and their timing during the Country Programme (CP) cycle are as follows:

- Assess progress towards the outcome (this will be most significantly explored during an outcome evaluation conducted later in the CP, although could be examined early on depending upon the nature of the outcome);
- Assess the factors affecting to the outcome (this could be addressed early, midterm or later in the CP);
- Assess key UNDP contributions (outputs), including those produced through "soft" assistance, to outcomes (this information is yielded at least midway through and later in the CP);
- Assess the partnership strategy (useful information can be culled at any point during the CP).

In other words, four major components — the outcome, substantive influences, UNDP's contribution and how UNDP works with other relevant actors — are examined in depth to varying degrees depending upon the nature of the exercise.

IV. GUIDING PRINCIPLES and METHODOLOGY

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Outcome evaluations are informed by three guiding principles: pre-eminence of outcome, flexible blueprints and awareness building. Evaluators, country office and programme staff should bear in mind these principles when they plan, prepare for, undertake and follow up on outcome evaluations.

1. Pre-eminence of outcome

An outcome evaluation aims to improve understanding of the outcome itself — its status and the factors that influence or contribute to its change. It does not look at the process of inputs, activities and other bureaucratic efforts but shifts attention to the substantive development results (outputs and outcomes) that they are aimed at affecting. It also provides real-time answers about the outcome rather than waiting until a project is completed and the outputs produced to ask questions. These answers may be part of a "questioning continuum."

Key differences distinguish outcome monitoring from outcome evaluation. Outcome monitoring involves periodic tracking of inputs, outputs and outcomes. Outcome evaluation involves making judgments about the **interrelationship** between inputs and outputs on the one hand and outcomes on the other. It is also important to note that although the review of contributions by UNDP and its partners is an integral component of such analysis, the precise degree of attribution and accountability among the various actors is not an overriding priority.

2. Flexible blueprints

There is no official blueprint for how to conduct an outcome evaluation. Each must be tailored to the nature of the individual outcome under review as well as the realities of time and data limitations. The role of an evaluator is to pass judgment based on his or her best professional opinion; it is not to collect large volumes of primary data or conduct methodologically perfect academic research. Inherent to the outcome evaluation approach is a rough but universal logic of analysis and reporting. Usually, an outcome evaluation begins with a review of change in the outcome itself, proceeds to an analysis of pertinent influencing factors, and then addresses the contribution of UNDP and its partners. It culminates in suggestions about how to improve the approach to results.

Outcome evaluations are designed to fill a number of different needs, ranging from early information about the appropriateness of UNDP's partnership strategy or impediments to the outcome, to mid-course adjustments, to lessons learned for the next Country Programme cycle.

3. Awareness building

The current focus on outcome evaluation reflects a new approach to assessment and review in UNDP. UNDP is internalizing results-based management and mainstreaming it throughout the processes and procedures of the organization. As with all large organizations, it will take time for UNDP and its partners to become familiar and comfortable with results-based evaluation. For some time, building awareness about this new approach will be an implicit goal in the conduct of outcome evaluation. Evaluators will play an important role in by sharing lessons learned while applying the methodology at a country level, and thereby helping UNDP refine the methodologies used in outcome evaluations.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the outcome evaluation will accommodate the needs in order to achieve the four (4) objectives of this exercise. There are four (4) steps to be undertaken by the evaluator: (For details methodology, the consultant should follow **UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators**, attached to the TOR)

1. Ascertaining the status of the outcome:
 - a. Identify baseline, indicators and benchmark (desk review)
 - b. Obtain contextual information (desk review)
 - c. Examine Prodocs, CPD, UNDAF (desk review)
 - d. Validate information (interviews, questionnaires)
 - e. Probe the selected indicators
 - f. Undertake constructive critic of the outcome formulation
2. Examining the factors affecting the outcome
 - a. Examine how the outcome has been influenced (desk review, interview)
 - b. Identify major contributing factors
 - c. Examine local sources of knowledge (existing documentation of gov, academia, donors, NGOs, etc)
 - d. Resolve issue of UNDP having an unintended effect or not having intended effect
3. Assessing the Contribution of UNDP

- a. Determine how coherent UNDP strategy and management focusing on change at the outcome level
 - b. Evaluate the alignment of UNDP planning and management in contributing to outcomes
 - c. Identify the effectiveness of individual outputs (if any) in contributing to outcomes
4. Evaluate partnership for changing the outcome
 - a. Determine any consensus among UNDP actors, stakeholders and partners on the partnership strategy designed was the most effective and efficient model to achieve the outcome
 - b. Learn how the partnership was established and how is the performance
 - c. Review how the partnership strategy affected the achievement of or the progress toward the outcome.

A core outline for an evaluation should present **findings and conclusions** based on the categories of analysis in an outcome evaluation. In addition, the core outline should include the rating of progress on outcomes and outputs and lessons learned and recommendations on how UNDP can improve its approach based on the findings/conclusions

Into the outline described above, evaluators may subsume the evaluative criteria as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, degree of change, sustainability; together with the usual deductive categories (findings, conclusion, and recommendations). Table 1 shows how the criteria may be applied within the core outline of an outcome evaluation report.

Table 1: Application of Evaluation Criteria to the Core Outline for an Outcome Evaluation		
Category of Analysis	Pertinent evaluation criteria	Place in the outline
1. Evidence of change in the outcome	Degree of change	Findings/conclusion
2. Review of factors influencing outcomes	Relevance Effectiveness	Findings/conclusion Lessons learned
3. UNDP contributions to outcome	Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Degree of change Sustainability	Findings/conclusion Lessons learned Recommendations
4. Partnerships for changing the outcome	Relevance Sustainability	Findings/conclusions Lessons learned

Evaluators need to agree with country offices on the core outline. In addition, they need to agree on supplementary aspects of work organization and report presentation including the methodological approach and use of executive summary and technical annexes.

Gender, Human Right, and Capacity Development.

Gender, Human Right (right based approach) and Capacity development need to be assessed the extent to which the intended outcome has contributed to these three development effectives. Especially for gender, the questions to be asked is that does the outcome reflect the interest, rights and concern of men, women and marginalized group. In the designing the methodology consultant need to group the sample or Focus Group Discussion based on gender that ensure data collected can be specified into gender component. On the human right it need to be assessed how the intended

outcome facilitate the claim of right-holder and the corresponding obligation of the duty bearer (UNDP Handbook Planning, Monitoring, Evaluating for Results, page 171-172). Duty bearers particularly group subject to discrimination need to be included in the sample. For capacity Development it needs to be evaluated the extent to which the intended outcome promotes national capacity development. Questions to be asked: Will the intervention / outcome sustainable? Can national system and processes be used or augmented? What are the existing national capacity assets in this area? (The Handbook page # 14).

V. DELIVERABLES

The ultimate product expected from the evaluation: a detailed report with findings, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of evaluation. The structure of the report should meet with the requirements of the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy.

VI. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT

The evaluation is commissioned by the UNDP Indonesia Country Office under coordination of the Planning and Monitoring Unit (PMEU). A programme officer from Planning Monitoring and Evaluation MEU (PMEU) will be assigned as task manager. The main role of the task manager is the quality assurance for the evaluation includes: a) provide TOR for the evaluation, b) select consultant to conduct the evaluation, c) support interview of respondents. The Environment Unit who own the outcome being evaluated will support the overall activities of the evaluation includes: a) prepare the schedule of the evaluation and arrange meetings with respondents, b) provide copies of the project documents, project QMR, project evaluation and reviews; c) provide budget for the evaluation (to hire consultants) and field visit as necessary. Final report will be reviewed and approved by the *Country Director*.

VII. TIME FRAME and assignment

The evaluator will be an international consultant with strong back ground in monitoring and evaluation with substantive knowledge on Sustainable Environment and Efficient Use of Energy. The evaluation will take place during June – July about 4 weeks (14 effective working days). This will include a preliminary desk review, design of evaluation scope and methodologies, data collection and analysis, and report writing

VIII. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EVALUATOR

- Design evaluation methodology following **UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators** for approval by the Head of PMEU;
- Data collection and analysis, including desk review, field visits, discussion and interview with stakeholders and beneficiaries, and conduct other means of data collection as and when required;
- Present the major findings and the first draft to PMEU and relevance Programme Unit;
- Refinement and editing of report after consultation and validation process with key stakeholders as well as the final comments from programme units and UNDP management;
- Ensure that the report is finalized within maximum 3 weeks after the mission completion.

Annex 2 - Evaluation Questions

Based on the ToR and preliminary desk research, the following lead questions were identified for the purpose of semi-structured discussions and key informant interviews with various interlocutors:

Question	Contributing to:
What are your views on environment in Indonesia?	n/a
What do you think of UNDP's contribution in terms of combating environment degradation and advocating the efficient and sustainable use of energy and other resources in Indonesia?	Relevance
What do you think of UNDP's strategic position in relation to the stated outcome?	Relevance
How has the programme supported the implementation of government priorities to contribute to the outcome? How has the UNDP programme responded to changing government priorities and needs?	Relevance
How could the programme have been designed differently to augment existing capacities (systems/processes) with technical expertise provided by UNDP?	Relevance
What has been UNDP's comparative strengths: policy/legislative support; technical/advisory support; budgetary support; demonstration projects; awareness raising	Effectiveness
Does the team (programme and project) have sufficient capacity to provide technical inputs to support the outcome?	Effectiveness
Did the programme design facilitate or hinder UNDP's contribution to the outcome?	Effectiveness
To what extent did the programme promote national capacity development?	Effectiveness
Was the partnership strategy the most effective and efficient model to achieve the outcome? (ie: does UNDP utilise its partnerships to take advantage of comparative strengths of its partners; were partnerships used to ensure the efficient use of budgetary resources?)	Effectiveness Efficiency
How were partnerships established and how is performance?	Effectiveness
What primary factors have affected the achievement of the outcome?	Effectiveness
Did the projects have sufficient budgetary resources to provide the support required by the government?	Efficiency
How would you change your approach for similar activities in the future?	Efficiency
What were the existing national capacity assets in this area?	Efficiency
What changes (positive-negative, intended-unintended) brought about by UNDP in terms of the stated outcome?	Impact
How has UNDP contributed to the improvement of the policy and legal framework to combat environmental degradation?	Impact

How has UNDP support improved Indonesia's compliance with the Rio conventions?	Impact
How will UNDP's contribution to the outcome impact the environmental living conditions and sustainable/efficient use of energy in communities in Indonesia?	Impact
What have been some of the key achievements within UNDP projects which can be scaled up to augment progress against the outcome?	Impact
Did the programme interventions reflect the interest, rights and concern of men, women and marginalized groups?	Impact
How did the programme facilitate the claims of right-holders and the corresponding obligation of duty bearers, contributing to the outcome? (ie: how have lives improved?)	Impact
How did the partnership strategy contribute to the achievement of or the progress toward the outcome?	Impact Sustainability
Is the progress against the outcome sustainable? How has UNDP contributed to sustainability?	Sustainability

Annex 3 - Stakeholders Interviewed

UNDP Indonesia:

Mr. Budhi Sayoko, Head, Environment Unit, UNDP Indonesia
Mr. Tomoyoko Uno, Programme Officer, Environment Unit, UNDP Indonesia
Ms. Veriana Andria, Programme Officer, Environment Unit, UNDP Indonesia
Ms. Silje Haugland, Programme Officer, Environment Unit, UNDP Indonesia
Mr. Iwan Kurniawan, Programme Officer, Environment Unit, UNDP Indonesia
Mr. Angger Wibowo, Head, Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, UNDP Indonesia
Mr. Sirman Purba, Programme Officer, Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, UNDP Indonesia

Government of Indonesia:

Mr. Djonli, Head of Sub-directorate, PEPDAS, Ministry of Forestry
Dr. Prihasto Setyanto, Head, Indonesian Agroclimate and Hydrology Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Zulhasi, Head of Ozone Layer Protection Division, Ministry of Environment
Ms. Tri Widayait, Head of Division on Climate Change Adaptation, Ministry of Environment
Dr. Edi Hilmawan, Head of Energy Conservation Division, Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology
Dr. Gatot Dwianto, Head of Technology Services Division, Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology
Mr. Asep Suwarna, Deputy National Project Director, BRESL, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources
Mr. Eko Adji Buwono, MCTAP Project
Mr. Gita Wardhana, MCTAP Project
Dr. Subhat Nurhakim, ATSEA Project
Mr. Amin Budiarjo, National Project Manager, ICCTF

Civil Society:

Mr. Agus Wismakumara, President of ASHRAE Indonesia Chapter

Annex 4 - Documents Referenced

'Indonesia Country Report: Climate Variability and Climate Changes, and their Implication,' (Government of Indonesia, 2007)

'The Other Half of Climate Change: Why Indonesia Must Adapt to Protect its Poorest People,' (UNDP Indonesia 2007)

'Indonesia Climate Change Sectoral Roadmap: in Brief', (Bappenas, 2009)

'Tracing Footsteps towards Self-Reliant Community: Lessons Learned in Managing Small Grants for the Environment,' (The GEF Small Grants Programme, 2011)

'Blueprint for Indonesia Climate Change Trust Fund (ICCTF),' (Government of Indonesia, 2009)

'Policy Recommendations: Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) Instrument for Indigenous Communities and/or Local Communities who will be affected by REDD+ Activities,' (UN-REDD and the National Forestry Council, 2010)

'Investing in a More Sustainable Indonesia: Country Environmental Analysis,' (World Bank Indonesia Report, 2009)

UNDP Indonesia Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010

UNDP Indonesia Country Programme Mid-Term Review, 2008

UNDP Indonesia Assessment of Development Results 2001-2009, 2010

UNDP Indonesia Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015 (Draft)

Indonesia MDG Reports – 2005, 2008, 2010

Indonesia Human Development Report 2004

UNDP Indonesia Annual Reports – 2007, 2008, 2009

UNDP Indonesia Environment Programme Project Documents, Progress and Annual Reports, Final Reviews (as applicable)