



**United Nations Development Programme
Global Environment Facility**

Indonesia



GEF Medium-size Project

**“Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing
Incentive Mechanism for Sustainable Watershed/ Land Management”
(PIMS 5224)**

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Date: 17/05/2021



i. Opening page

Title of the UNDP supported GEF financed project

Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing Incentive Mechanism for Sustainable Watershed/Land Management

Project ID#S

UNDP Atlas Project ID: 00090780/00096387

UNDP PIMS ID: 5224

GEF Project ID: 5848

Project start date: 31 August 2016

Project end date

Planned: 31 August 2020

Revised: 30 June 2021

Project duration

Planned 4 years (48 months), revised 67 months

Region

South East Asia

Country

Indonesia

GEF Focal Area: Multi focal area and Land Degradation

GEF Strategic Objectives:

CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge

CD4 To strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines

CD5 To enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends

LD3 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape; and

LD4 Increase capacity to apply adaptive management tools in SLM.

Executing Agency/Implementing Partner

Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Evaluation Team:

Mr. Giacomo Morelli – International Evaluator / Team Leader

Mr. Bachtiar W. Mutaqin – National Evaluator



ii. Acknowledgement

A deep thanks to all the people who have taken the time to provide information used in the writing of this evaluation report. A special thanks to the Project Management Unit staff, for their support to the Evaluation Team in organizing the entire process of remote meetings and interviews that made possible the evaluation exercise.



iii. Table of contents

i. Opening page	i
ii. Acknowledgement	ii
iii. Table of contents	iii
IV. Acronyms and abbreviations	v
1. Executive summary	1
1.1. Project Information Table.....	1
1.2. Brief project description	2
1.3. Evaluation Ratings Table.....	2
1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions	3
1.4.1. Findings	3
1.4.1. Conclusions.....	4
1.5. Synthesis of the key lessons learned	4
1.6. Recommendations Summary Table.....	4
2. Introduction.....	5
2.1. Evaluation purpose.....	5
2.2. Scope of the evaluation.....	5
2.3. Methodology	6
2.4. Data collection and analysis	6
2.5. Ethics	6
2.6. Limitations	6
3. Project description	8
3.1. Project start and duration	8
3.2. Development context.....	8
3.3. Problems that the project sought to address	9
3.4. Immediate and development objectives	10
3.5. Expected results	11
3.6. Total resources	11
3.7. Main stakeholders	12
3.8. Description of the project's Theory of Change	13
4. Findings	13
4.1. Project Design/Formulation	13
4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators	13
4.1.b. Assumptions and Risks	14
4.1.c. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design.....	15
4.1.d. Planned stakeholder participation	16
4.1.e. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector	16
4.1.f. Gender responsiveness of project design	16
4.1.g. Social and Environmental Safeguards.....	16



4.2. Project Implementation	16
4.2.a. Adaptive Management	16
4.2.b. Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements.....	17
4.2.c. Project Finance and Co-finance	17
4.2.d. Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E...	18
4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight, Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution.....	19
4.2.f. Risk Management.....	19
4.3. Project Results and Impacts	20
4.3.a. Progress towards objective and expected outcomes	20
4.3.b. Relevance	39
4.3.c. Effectiveness.....	40
4.3.d. Efficiency	41
4.3.e. Coordination.....	42
4.3.f. Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, overall likelihood of sustainability.....	42
4.3.g. Country ownership	43
4.3.h. Gender equality and women's empowerment.....	43
4.3.i. Cross-cutting Issues	44
4.3.j. GEF additionality.....	44
4.3.k. Catalytic/Replication Effect.....	45
4.3.l. Progress to Impact.....	45
5. Main findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned.....	46
5.1. Main findings.....	46
5.2. Conclusions.....	47
5.3. Recommendations.....	48
5.4. Lessons learned	48
6. Annexes	I
Annex 1 - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)	II
Annex 2 - TE virtual mission agenda	XIII
Annex 3 - List of persons interviewed	XV
Annex 4 - List of documents reviewed	XVIII
Annex 5 - Evaluation Question Matrix.....	XX
Annex 6 - TE Rating scale.....	XXIV
Annex 7 - UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators	XXV
Annex 8 – Evaluation Report Clearance Form	XXVI



IV. Acronyms and abbreviations

BAPPENAS	Ministry of National Development Planning
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CPD	Country Programme Document
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forest
MTR	Mid Term Review
NIM	National Implementation Modality
ProDoc	Project Document
PMU	Project Management Unit
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SWM	Sustainable Water Management
TE	Terminal Evaluation
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNPDF	United Nations Partnership for Development Framework



1. Executive summary

1.1. Project Information Table

Project Details		Project Milestones	
Project Title:	Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Convention through Enhancing Incentive Mechanisms for Sustainable Watershed/Land Management	PIF Approval Date:	12-Jun-14
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5224	CEO Endorsement Date (FSP)/Approval date (MSP)	26-Oct-15
GEF Project ID:	5848	Prodoc Signature Date:	31-Aug-16
UNDP Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID:	00090780/00096387	Date Project Manager Hired:	15-Jan-18
Country/Countries:	Indonesia	Inception Workshop Date:	17-Feb-17
Region:	Asia and Pacific	Mid-Term Review Completion Date:	29-Sep-19
Focal Area:	Multifocal areas, Land Degradation	Terminal Evaluation Completion date:	26-May-21
GEF Operational Programme or Strategic Priorities/Objectives:	CD2 To generate, access and use information and knowledge. CD4 To strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines. CD5 To enhance capacities to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends . LD3 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape; and . LD4 Increase capacity to apply adaptive management tools in SLM.	Planned Operational Closure Date:	30-Jun-21
Trust Fund:	GEF		
Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Directorate of Planning, Evaluation, and Control of Watershed, Directorate of Environmental Affairs and Directorate of Forestry and Water Resources)		
NGOs/CBOs Involvement:	27 CBOs (beneficiaries)		
Private sector involvement:	PT. Perhutani (beneficiary)		
Geospatial coordinates of project sites:	MDM Sumberbulu:49S: x: 9103257.5 y: 691830.7, MDM Way Khilau: 48S: x: 9385843.4 y: -171751.8		
Financial information			
PDF/PPG	at approval (US\$M)	at PDF/PPG completion (US\$M)	
GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation	0.10	Not reported	
Co-financing for project preparation	---	Not reported	
Project	At CEO endorsement (US\$M)	At Terminal Evaluation (US\$M)	
[1] UNDP (regular track + in-kind)	0.05 + 0.05 = 0.10	Not reported	
[2] Government (in-kind)	5.50	Not reported	
[3] Total co-financing [1+2]	5.60	Not reported	
[4] Total GEF Funding	1.88	1.70	
[1] Total Project Funding [3 + 4]	7.48	---	



1.2. Brief project description

The key rationale of the project “Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing Incentive Mechanism for Sustainable Watershed/ Land Management”, hereinafter named CCCD project, is to address the issue of weak enforcement of Indonesia’s legislative and regulatory frameworks.

The project, therefore, aims at addressing the weakness of the country’s existing financial and economic instruments, which proved to be insufficient deterrents to unsustainable natural resource use.

Sustainable watershed management is used as a tool for mainstreaming global environmental values while strengthening the policy and legislative instruments to reinforce an enabling environment for the implementation of the three Rio Conventions: the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

The long-term goal of the project is “to strengthen a set of important capacities for Indonesia to make better Sustainable Land Management (SLM) / Sustainable Watershed Management (SWM) decisions to meet and sustain global environmental obligations”.

The objective of the project is “to strengthen targeted legal and regulatory frameworks as well as economic incentives to meet global environmental outcomes through sustainable watershed management”.

The design of the project includes three outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Strengthened policy, legislative, and economic instruments.
- Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional and individual capacities to mainstream SLM/SWM
- Outcome 3: Improving awareness of global environmental values

1.3. Evaluation Ratings Table

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating
M&E design at entry	1 – <i>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</i>
M&E Plan Implementation	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Overall Quality of M&E	3 – <i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>
2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Effectiveness	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
Efficiency	5 – <i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
Overall Project Outcome Rating	4 – <i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
4. Sustainability	Rating
Financial sustainability	3 – <i>Moderately Likely (ML)</i>
Socio-political sustainability	<i>Unable to assess (U/A)</i>
Institutional framework and governance	4 – <i>Likely</i>
Environmental sustainability	4 – <i>Likely</i>
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	3 – <i>Moderately Likely (ML)</i>



1.4. Summary of findings and conclusions

1.4.1. Findings

Project design, visualized in the Results Framework, did not constitute neither an effective guidance tool for the implementation nor a useful tool for M&E purpose. The objective's indicators were not SMART, outcomes did not present any indicators. Output's indicators were the only ones available to track the project implementation.

The project design was as well very redundant. The formulation of objective, outcome and output was very similar. Although this occurrence, the overall idea of the project was clear: to lay down the groundwork for an improved implementation of the three Rio Convention, i.e. UNFCCC, UNCCCD and CBD, at country level.

The dimensions of income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, and livelihood benefits of the broader impact of the project are not captured at any level in the project design.

The ProDoc did not provide any guidance on how to engage effectively during the project with relevant stakeholders.

The implementation of the project did not envisage any change in its design, decided and formalized during sessions of the Project Board. No major adaptive management decisions were formalized.

The implementation focused on the achievement of output indicators. The Project Management Unit (PMU) led the implementation at field level successfully. Instead, MoEF led the process related to strengthening policy, legislative, and economic instruments.

MoEF cofinancing was compliant with the initial commitment of the institution to the project.

All work led by MoEF was neither monitored in the frame of the project nor reported in any documents.

Sustainable watershed management was at the centre of the project implementation, and, as such, it was promoted as a tool for replication in other areas of the country.

The strengthening policy, legislative, and economic instruments happened outside of the project frame: activities were funded with other funds and not reported to UNDP. GEF funding was not relevant for the implementation of these activities.

The project was effective in achieving its outputs.

The intervention resulted to be sustainable and replicable. This is due prevalently to the work done at the district level in collaboration with local stakeholders, i.e., public authorities, communities, CBOs, and a private company.

Sustainability at the national level is not fully assessable. Due to the lack of reporting on outcome 1, the TE Team could not coordinate with the PMU interviews with stakeholders who participate in the process.

Although gender issues were not captured in the project design, the CCCD project promoted gender equality by contributing to the improvement of the standard of living and increasing income by agricultural products innovation and artisanal home production, and by supporting the women's participation in sustainable management of natural resources.

Job creation and income generation, reforestation, promotion of climate change adaptation and mitigation measured, and capacity development of local communities and local authorities were key issues addressed at the district level.



1.4.1. Conclusions

Project design, as per the ProDoc and related Results Framework, did not include enough information for the PB and PMU to implement the project in coherence with its design. Indicators at output level were the only elements clearly defined. The evaluation acknowledges that the choice was legitimate: the Results Framework included so many flaws that it should have been completely revised. Indeed, the MTR, as well, did not report any recommendation on the issue.

The actual achievement at a level higher than outputs is not measurable. The evaluation assessed the achievement at outcome and objective level as moderately satisfactorily, taking into consideration the achievement at output level achievement and the opinions of stakeholders interviewed.

It is self-evident that communication between PMU, Project Board, and UNDP did not work properly. The lack of official documentation reporting about outcome 1 represents a concern in terms of project accountability.

The main achievement of the project, i.e., the successful implementation of activities in two micro watersheds, is very significant. MoEF can use the experiences to replicate the approach and scale activities in other areas of the country.

The plans are actually recognized as a practical tool to implement the Rio Conventions at community level, being the restoration and conservation of natural resources, sustainable land and water management, and the acknowledgement of the nexus between environment, livelihoods, and development. Moreover, MoEF is already replicating some of their elements.

The micro watershed approach is centered in rural communities and local authorities. The replication of it is somehow restricted in areas where the two groups of stakeholders are predominant. Engagement with private sector, big economic players, was not envisaged by the project.

Cross cutting issues relevant to sustainable development were promoted by the project, i.e., gender equality, human rights, capacity development, and climate change adaptation.

1.5. Synthesis of the key lessons learned

The present evaluation identified a lesson learned: building on the needs of communities, and promoting cross cutting issues revealed once again to be key for successful implementation of initiatives with rural communities. Direct and open communication with all stakeholders, development of tools and study with a serious scientific approach for knowledge generation; promotion of community participation; and application of generated knowledge to tailor relevant solutions are as well the main elements to promote rural development.

1.6. Recommendations Summary Table

Rec #	TE recommendation	Entity Responsible	Time frame
1	Project design should avoid redundancies within and amongst different hierarchical levels of the Result Framework, i.e., objective, outcomes, and outputs. A redundant Result Framework does not allow an effective project management and impedes the identification of relevant changes promoted/induced by projects. Indicators of objectives, outcomes, and outputs should capture different changes produced by the project under consideration. Outputs refer to changes under almost the full control of the project management. i.e., what the project actually does, while outcomes and objectives capture changes to which the project contributes to. It is then important, that the team in charge of	UNDP MoEF	When a new initiative in formulated by the two entities



	writing project documents include both thematic specialists and M&E specialists. The two kinds of expertise are important to have a get to a project design that later can guide the implementation towards its goals.		
2	It is important to get to a common agreement on what are the roles of each project partner. Agreements and decisions should be put in writing, archived, and reported to donors. In this way, a higher level of transparency and accountability is ensured.	UNDP MoEF	During the project design phase or during the inception phase of a new project
3	Test the micro watershed approach with relevant modifications, to contexts where the private sector has a predominant role, both as an actor of economic development and as a land degradation driver. Indeed, matching economic and social development with the conservation of the environment is the main aspiration of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD, and CBD). A new collaboration between the two institutions may be the right occasion to do that.	UNDP MoEF	Whenever it is possible.

2. Introduction

2.1. Evaluation purpose

The purpose of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) is to assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming in Indonesia. The TE also aims at promoting accountability and transparency, and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

2.2. Scope of the evaluation

The TE evaluated the results according to the criteria established in the “Guidance for conducting terminal evaluation of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects”. It involved all beneficiary actors, as well as those responsible for the execution and implementation of the project indicated in the Project Document (ProDoc). The exercise covered the design, execution, and results of the project focusing, therefore, on the following three categories:

- **Project Design/Formulation** including the following sub-categories:
Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators; Assumptions and Risks; Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design; Planned stakeholder participation and; Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector.
- **Project Implementation including the following sub-categories:**
Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation); Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements; Project Finance and Co-finance; Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment; UNDP implementation/oversight and Implementing Partner execution, overall project implementation/execution, coordination, and operational issues; and Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards).
- **Project Results and Impacts including the following sub-categories:**
Progress towards objective and expected outcomes; Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Overall outcome; Sustainability (financial, socio-political, institutional framework and



governance, environmental, and overall likelihood of sustainability); Country ownership; Gender quality and women's empowerment; Cross-cutting Issues; GEF Additionality; Catalytic/Replication Effect; and Progress to Impact.

Based upon findings, the TE exercise exposes conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

The final evaluation was carried out based on the end of the Project term and was foreseen both in the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Indonesia and in the evaluation plans of the GEF.

2.3. Methodology

A theory-based and utilization-focused approach was used for the TE.

Theory-based evaluations focus on analysing a project's underlying logic and causal linkages. Indeed, projects are built on assumptions on how and why they are supposed to achieve the agreed results through the selected strategy. This set of assumptions constitutes the "program theory" or "theory of change", which, in UNDP/GEF projects is visualized in the Results Framework. The TE was based on the theory of change analysing the strategy underpinning the project, including objectives and assumptions, and assessing its robustness and realism.

An utilization-focused approach is based on the principle that evaluations and reviews should be judged on their usefulness to their intended users; therefore, they should be planned and conducted in ways that enhance the likely utilization of both the findings and of the process itself to inform decisions.

2.4. Data collection and analysis

As planned in the inception report, the research design of the evaluation exercise has used the following primary and secondary data collection methods:

- Desk review
- Individual interviews
- Group interviews

Different methodological approaches to data analysis were applied to identify key findings from the collected data as well as to draw conclusions, identify lessons learned, and make recommendations. These approaches included:

- Contribution analysis: To assess causal questions and infer causality in project evaluations;
- Trend analysis: To understand how activities and outputs contribute to common objectives over time; and
- Comparative analysis: To compare the perceptions and opinions of stakeholders and stakeholder groups towards the different achievements of the project.

The TE Evaluative Matrix is included in Annex 5.

2.5. Ethics

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations".

2.6. Limitations

The entire evaluation exercise was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic in accordance with what was planned in the inception report.

The TE team met all the actors foreseen in the Inception Report and covered satisfactorily all activities of the CCCD project.



The occurrence of the pandemic and the necessity to conduct the evaluation remotely had the following implications for the development of the evaluation process:

- The actors in the project areas were interviewed individually or in groups and it has not been possible to carry out focus groups.
- Field visits to project sites were not possible.

The TE took place in the months of March and April 2021. It was fully conducted remotely, with both members of the TE Team working in home-office.

It entailed three phases:

1. Inception phase

It took place from March 1st to March 8th. The TE Team delivered the inception report that was approved by UNDP.

2. Data collection phase

It took place from March 9th to April 2nd. At the end of the mission, the ET Team conducted a Presentation of the TE initial findings on April 6th.

The TE Team worked in close collaboration with the PMU to carry out the data collection phase. PMU was in charge of setting up an agenda of meetings for the ET Team members.

The TE Team received by PMU the very last documents, which were related to the production of outputs under outcome 1, at the very end of the data collection phase. For this reason, the phase went on until April 2nd, which is a few days later than what was planned in the inception report. UNDP and the TE Team then renegotiated the deadlines for the submission of deliverables.

During the data collection phase, the National Evaluator participated in almost all interviews, while the International Evaluator, who cannot speak Bahasa Indonesia, participated only in interviews with high-level national officials and with those stakeholders who could speak English. As mentioned in the inception report, the TE Team believed that participation in all interviews of the International Evaluator would have made the interviews unnecessarily heavy being there the necessity for translation Bahasa Indonesia/English.

3. Reporting phase

It took place from March 30th to April 26th. The deliverables of the reporting phase were the Draft TE Report and the Final TE Report, i.e., the report at hand. In the Final TE Report, the TE Team addressed the comments received on the Draft Report from UNDP and its partners. In addition, the ET Team delivered a TE audit trail form.

As already mentioned in the Inception Report, the effect of remote communication on the perception of the questions (by the interviewees) and the responses (by the ET Team) is not estimable.

Annex 2 shows the TE virtual mission agenda, annex 3, the list of persons interviewed, and annex 4, the list of documents reviewed.

The TE Team conducted 20 individual and 12 group interviews involving 58 people amongst PMU (2), UNDP officers (5), representatives of national (6, including the National Project Director) and local authorities (25), and community members (19).



3. Project description

3.1. Project start and duration

CCCD project started in August 2016 and will end in June 2021. The duration of the project expected in the original ProDoc was 48 months. The project will have a total duration of 58 months. It was extended by ten months. Specific project cycle management (PCM) milestones are not described neither in the Project Document nor in the Results Framework. The project was implemented according to UNDP's support to the National Implementation Modality (NIM).

3.2. Development context

Handling environmental problems requires great synergy between ministries or agencies concerned and must be carried out comprehensively. Various obstacles must be faced in the handling process, including limited funds, unrepresentative and unreliable information, lack of coordination between institutions, limited technology, and limited human resource capacity, both on the government and community side. Limited personnel or technical staff in related institutions, ultimately results in weak monitoring of environmental conditions; and second, lack of community awareness in efforts to conserve the environment where they live.

Community behaviour, directly and indirectly, will affect the conditions of the environment in which they live. Likewise, land use changes, environmental degradation, and loss of biodiversity also have an impact on changes in community behaviour as a process of adaptation.

Indonesia is currently suffering from bottlenecks that obstruct the successful implementation of the Rio Conventions (CBD, UNCFF, and UNCCD). The main obstacles that must be overcome immediately are the weakness of policies, legislation, and economic instruments; the weakness of institutional and individual capacities in realizing sustainable land management; and lack of awareness of global environmental values and services. The existing collection of legislative and administrative instruments (e.g., laws, by-laws, codes) for the Rio Conventions is not ideal due to the lack of the ability to implement and control the use of natural resources.

One of the instruments in sustainable national development is to use the concept of a watershed area. Almost a decade since the issuance of Government Regulation no. 37/2012, the implementation of watershed-based management policies is still predominantly carried out at a regional scale, and as a result, watershed planning and management programs still tend to be at the theoretical level at the regional policy level and cannot be properly understood at a more detailed scale, such as at the village level. Moreover, there is also a lack of organizational and structural resources to organize and manage programs. In addition, a control and assessment process has not been developed in several situations; consequently, management and compliance remain weak.

The effort of management and enforcement of natural resources, forest rehabilitation, as well as land conservation, requires a synergy between the ministries, organizations, and NGOs and must be carried out in a systematic and comprehensive manner. However, there are numerous obstacles that should be addressed, e.g., 1) limited financial and technical resources, 2) low degree of cooperation between the various authorities, 3) lack of contact and coordination between national and regional governments, 4) resistance from several government officials to work with and include NGO representatives in the decision-making, 5) lack of awareness of high-level decision-makers about the value of biodiversity, 6) weak and unequal private sector involvement in sustainable management practices, and 7) poverty which combined with international demand for Indonesian resources, that is sometimes leading to illegal activities.

As an effect of a highly decentralized government, sometimes there are overlapping policies and priorities as well as poor decisions on the global environment due to lack of access to more trustworthy data and information. Regional and national needs are also often at odds with regional



disparities in poverty. Moreover, the spatial distribution of forest, wildlife, and resources, including watershed boundaries, often extends across protected areas and through provinces. This situation is worsened by a weak commitment from relevant agencies and representatives of key stakeholders to collaborate and coordinate their programs and interventions. This conflict results in difficulties in structuring transparency and maintaining stakeholders' involvement across diverse administrative borders. This kind of disconnection leads to problems in preparing, executing, and controlling changes within the administrative boundaries.

3.3. Problems that the project sought to address

There are a number of problems hindering the operations of government ministries to address environmental issues. These include insufficient funding, a limited flow of information, weak coordination, and weak technical staff capacities. The latter includes insufficient human resources for enforcement and monitoring, limited technology, and inadequate training and awareness-raising on environmental issues. High-level decision makers' limited awareness about the value of environmental resources has resulted in the environment being undervalued and not incorporated into planning decisions. An additional barrier is the inability of the MoEF to effectively carry out its mandate to coordinate the planning and implementation of environmental compliance and enforcement among sectoral agencies.

Three key challenges underpin Indonesia's efforts to rehabilitate its degraded forest and land: firstly, the forestry sector presents a microcosm that magnifies Indonesia's significant but not insurmountable challenges in realizing gender equality overall. Secondly, natural resource management - especially the management of forest and land - is a deeply technical process that is influenced by still-evolving capacities and knowledge. Thirdly, institutional responsibility for this process has until recently been determined through ad hoc arrangements, which have generated a high level of uncertainty.

Indonesia is still suffering from bottlenecks that hamper its implementation of the Rio Conventions, i.e., the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). One major hurdle to overcome is the weakness of the current legislative and regulatory frameworks. The current set of instruments (e.g., laws, by-laws, codes) are sub-optimal not only because they lack enforcement power, but also regulations around the utilization of natural capital.

Although numerous policies and programmes exist, they are often not mainstreamed into the national, provincial, and local development planning processes. Additionally, there are often insufficient systemic and institutional capacities for planning and managing initiatives, and in many cases, no monitoring and evaluation mechanisms exist. The collective result is that programmes are ultimately poorly managed, and policies remain unenforced.

In addition, cooperation projects with the government are needed to fill the gap and to bridge the coordination. Indonesia's geography is such that the distribution of forest, wildlife, and resources extends beyond protected area borders and across different provinces' borders; whilst key stakeholders across these borders resist collaboration and coordination, the effective implementation of their programmes and interventions in support of the Rio Conventions cannot be realised and this remains a major systemic challenge.

Exacerbating this inadequate coordination is the dissonance between geographic boundaries and administrative boundaries. In fact, one of the main challenges in managing watersheds at the field level is the incompatibility of watershed boundaries with administrative boundaries. This incompatibility results in difficulty in structuring accountability and securing the participation of stakeholders who live in different administrative boundaries. Additionally, the disconnect leads to



difficulty in development planning, implementation, and monitoring within administrative boundaries.

Financial and technical resource limitations invariably mean that the complexity of the human and ecological nexus in Indonesia is not reflected fully in responses. Planning frameworks and associated decision-making bodies are thus generally devoid of economic incentives to address the Rio Conventions, and existing subsidies, taxes, and other fiscal measures distort the true value of the environment and natural ecosystem.

Indonesia's high-level decision makers' lack of awareness about the value of biodiversity is problematic in and of itself, but also drives the aforementioned lack of resourcing and investment. Due to this lack of awareness, biodiversity issues have not been made a priority, have not been considered as resources that are economically important, and have not been mainstreamed into economic sectors. A widespread lack of awareness and understanding among the public about numerous environmental issues, such as the rationale behind protecting areas, also inhibits the implementation of the conventions.

Finally, weak and inconsistent private sector engagement in sustainable management practices, and poverty, combined with the international demand for Indonesia's natural resources, that leads to illegal activity represents another major challenge.

CCCD project aimed at strengthening a set of policy, legislative, and economic instruments as incentive mechanisms for mainstreaming global environmental obligations of Indonesia. It did so by integrating global environmental values and principles within planning frameworks for integrated water resource management (sustainable watershed management). Therefore, the project attempted to strengthen targeted foundational capacities (systemic, institutional, and individual) to reduce pressure on natural resources through competing land uses, identify and test innovative mechanism to finance sustainable forest management to protect the watershed, as well as to mainstream synergies and best practices for monitoring impacts and assessing ecosystem services.

CCCD project aims at moving ahead with the 2030 Agenda specifically by pursuing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 13 "Climate Action", and 15 "Life on Land".

3.4. Immediate and development objectives

CCCD project supports the Outcome 3 of the United Nations Partnership For Development Framework (UNPDF) 2011- 2015: "By 2020, Indonesia is sustainably managing its natural resources, on land and at sea, with an increased resilience to the effects of climate change, disasters, and other shocks". It also supports Outcome 5, which is to have strengthened climate change mitigation, adaptation, and environmental sustainability measures in targeted vulnerable provinces, sectors, and communities. It is as well coherent with Outcome 2 of the UNPDF, which calls for full participation of civil society in the strengthening of democratic processes resulting in pro-poor, gender responsive, peaceful, more equitable and accountable resource allocation and better protection of vulnerable groups.

It also contributes to the UNDP Strategic Plan Outputs:

1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals, and waste; and

2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.

Moreover, it contributes as well to Outcome n. 2.1 of the UNDP Country Program (CPD 2016-2020) "Responsible national institutions and relevant stakeholders are more effective in managing



environmental resources” with an effective contribution to Output 2.1.1 “Government, private sector, CBO partners have coherent and effective policy frameworks, action plans, implementing arrangement and funding arrangement to sustainably manage terrestrial ecosystem.”

Finally, the CCCD project is as well consistent with the objectives of the GEF’s Strategy on Land Degradation under the Fifth Replenishment, specifically LD-3. Actually, LD-3 calls for the building of capacities to reduce pressure on natural resources through competing land uses, the development of innovative financing mechanisms for sustainable forest management targeted to protecting watersheds, as well as to mainstream synergies and best practices for monitoring impacts and assessing ecosystem services.

3.5. Expected results

The long-term goal of the project is “to strengthen a set of important capacities for Indonesia to make better SLM/SWM decisions to meet and sustain global environmental obligations”.

The objective of the project is “to strengthen targeted legal and regulatory frameworks as well as economic incentives to meet global environmental outcomes through sustainable watershed management”.

The design of the project includes the following outcomes and outputs:

- Outcome 1: Strengthened policy, legislative, and economic instruments.
 - Output 1.1: Targeted policies, legal and regulatory instruments are amended (strengthened).
 - Output 1.2: Best practice economic instruments developed.
 - Output 1.3: SLM mainstreamed into development policies/strategies.
 - Output 1.4: Strengthen institutional mechanisms for improved coordination and collaboration.
- Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional and individual capacities to mainstream SLM/SWM
 - Output 2.1: Priority SWM selected from 15 national priorities watersheds and feasibility study conducted.
 - Output 2.2: Pilot activities to mainstream Rio Conventions into SWM at selected sites.
 - Output 2.3: Training programme on improved methodologies and analytical skills.
 - Output 2.4: Improved monitoring and evaluation frameworks to measure and facilitate compliance.
 - Output 2.5: Strengthened SLM/SWM institutional mandates.
- Outcome 3: Improving awareness of global environmental values
 - Output 3.1: Stakeholder dialogues on the value of Rio Conventions
 - Output 3.2: Brochures, bulletins, and articles on the Rio Conventions
 - Output 3.3: Public service announcement on environmentally friendly behaviour
 - Output 3.4: Improved educational content and youth engagement

3.6. Total resources

The total resources allocated to the CCCD project at CEO endorsement of the ProDoc are presented in the table below:

Project Financing	Amount (in USD)
1. GEF financing	1,880,000
2. UNDP contribution (cash)	50,000
3. UNDP contribution (in kind)	50,000



4. Government	5,500,000
5. Other partners	-
6. Total co-financing [2+3+4+5]	5,600,000
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1+6]	7,480,000

3.7. Main stakeholders

Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF)

The MoEF is responsible for biodiversity conservation, protected area and wildlife management, forest management and REDD+, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. In addition, the MoEF is responsible for coordinating all activities related to environmental issues, watershed management, land degradation, compliance monitoring and supervision, and environmental criminal case investigation. The MoEF is also responsible for protecting, rehabilitating, and conserving soil and water.

The focal points for the three Rio Conventions belong to the Directorate of Watershed Management and Evaluation (UNCCD), the Directorate of Adaptation on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation (CBD) within the MoEF.

Actually, the Directors of the three Directorates constituted the Project Board.

The National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS)

The National Development Planning Agency, known as BAPPENAS, is the national entity responsible for national economic and development planning. It is in charge of the development of strategies and policies in determining financial allocations for the various sectors of the national economy, including mainstreaming and coordinating the environmental programmes (i.e. watershed management/land degradation, biodiversity conservation, and climate change) and budgeting them into the national development planning system.

BAPPENAS is, as well, in charge of coordinating the implementation of the National Action Plan to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions as well as the Sub-National Action Plan to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions. BAPPENAS helps develop the National Adaptation Plan, in coordination with line ministries, and the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution as part of Indonesia's commitment to helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The Director of the institution sits on the Project Board.

Provincial and local authorities

The authorities of Lampung and East Java Provinces, and those of Pesawaran District in Lampung and Malang in East Java participate in the project by supporting project staff in implementing activities in the two project watershed management plans.

Communities

The communities of the villages, Bayas Jaya in Pasawaran District (Lampung Province) and Bringin and Bambang in Malang District (East Java) are the target populations of the pilot activities foreseen in the project design.

Private sector

A broad and not-specific engagement with the project was foreseen in the project design.



3.8. Description of the project's Theory of Change

The project's Theory of Change is straightforward. The main assumption of the project is that better awareness and capacities of institutions and individuals at all levels in the country, i.e., national and local institutions, private sector, non-governmental organizations, and communities and the promotion of pertinent policy, legislative and economic instruments will help Indonesia to comply with its international obligations. i.e., a better implementation of the three Rio Conventions as per the project's long-term goal "to strengthen a set of important capacities for Indonesia to make better SLM/SWM decisions to meet and sustain global environmental obligations".

To reach the long-term goal, sustainable watershed management is promoted as a tool for replication in other areas of the country.

4. Findings

4.1. Project Design/Formulation

4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators

The Results Framework reports indicators at an objective and output level. Outcomes do not present indicators for the measurement of their achievement.

The three project objective indicators have the following features:

- Each indicator can be clearly attributed to the three project outcomes. Their formulation is almost the same as the formulation of each outcome. The design of the Results Framework is very redundant.
- They are not SMART:
 - The first two are Specific as they refer to specific changes: better implementation of Rio Conventions (Indicator 1), increase in coordination amongst stakeholders (Indicator 2), whereas Indicator 3 is Not Specific as it simply broadly relates to an increase of appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the public.
 - They are not Measurable referring to a generic increase and improvement without defining the criteria to judge these changes. Target levels are not specified.
 - Because of their non-measurability, they are not Attainable.
 - They are Relevant.
 - Because of their non-measurability, they are not Time-Bound.

The TE exercise summarizes the project strategy as follows:

- Outputs under Outcome 1: generating knowledge through redaction of assessments and feasibility studies and consequent production regulatory frameworks;
- Outputs under Outcome 2: generating site specific knowledge, engaging with local communities both at the institutional and village levels, and supporting the implementation of locally tailored solutions to environmental problems; and
- Outputs under Outcome 3: generating environmental awareness by conveying messages in support of activities implemented under outcomes 1 and 2.

The core of the project strategy is to do the groundwork for a better implementation at national and local level of the Rio Conventions. This is a necessity for the country as generally acknowledged by all stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation exercise.



As mentioned in the MTR report, the achievement of each of the three outcomes does not necessarily imply the achievement of the other outcomes. The project design does not explicitly express how each outcome and its related outputs and activities should or may feed into the others: the design is loose and leaves a large amount of room to manoeuvre for those who implement the project.

The formulation of the objective, the outcomes, and the outputs of the project is redundant: the formulation of the objective and outcomes do not capture any changes that are not already captured at output level. Consequently, the indicators at output level are the only ones available to measure project performance.

Indicators of outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 are SMART. They relate to the formulation of a wide array of documents (assessments, guidelines, feasibility studies, and frameworks).

Indicators of outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 are SMART. Indicator 2.2.2. lacks the target value. All other indicators relate mainly to the formulation of a wide array of documents (feasibility studies, reports, assessments, training modules, and strategies). Formally, Indicator 2.2.3. is not an indicator. However, having lessons learned systematized to scale up the project approach at national level, the TE considers it as a pertinent indicator.

Four indicators, related to outputs under outcome 3, are not well formulated. Indicator 3.1.3 *“Awareness of the value of the environment, as well as the Rio Conventions, is increased”* is not fully SMART being non-Measurable, and consequently non-Attainable, as it refers to a generic increase without defining the criteria to judge this change. Indicators 3.4.3 *“Tree planting in the selected watershed”* and 3.4.4 *“High school and youth field visit and study tour”* lack target values. Finally, Indicators 3.4.5 *“Lesson learned report developed”* is not an indicator.

As mentioned in the MTR report, *“...The indicators at output level are broken down into project milestones representing detailed and suggested steps for activity implementation towards the achievement of the final targets, but are not in fact indicators. These implementation steps aim to ensure both the participation and buy-in of stakeholders through workshops, and the approval of the Project Board, as the means through which to promote individual and institutional capacity development...”*

The Results Framework does not present any indicators to capture broader development impacts, e.g., income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and livelihood benefits. Good governance is the only element included. In fact, it is at the core of the design. No indicator has a gender dimension with the exception of indicator 2.4.3, which refers to gender balance between the participants for trainings to improve the M&E capacities of Indonesia public officers.

The idea of the project is that the achievement of the three outcomes is key to promote the implementation of the Rio Conventions. In doing so, in fact, the project will address the main barriers for their effective implementation, i.e., insufficient funding, a limited flow of information, weak coordination, and weak technical staff capacities, including resources for enforcement and monitoring, limited technology, which result in the environment being undervalued and not incorporated into planning decisions.

4.1.b. Assumptions and Risks

The Result Frameworks of the CCCD project includes 36 elements under the column “assumptions and risks” split throughout project outcomes and outputs. However, with only an exception, these elements are not assumptions and risks and, therefore, they have no utility to help the implementation of activities and achieve expected outputs.



The table below presents some examples and related explanations:

Element (as per the Results Framework)	Explanation
The project will be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner	This cannot be an assumption or risk. UNDP project must be executed in a transparent, holistic, adaptive, and collaborative manner
Institutions and working groups are open to change	The project aims at producing a change. The willingness of institutions and working groups to be open to change is not an external factor that may hamper the success of the project. It is one of the challenges of the project itself.
Government staff and non-state stakeholder representatives are actively engaged in the project	Government staff and non-state stakeholder representatives are beneficiaries of the project. Their lack of engagement with the project would prove that the project is not relevant to them.
Policy and institutional reforms and modifications recommended by the project are politically, technically, and financially feasible and approved by the Project Board	Project recommendations politically, technically, and financially unfeasible would represent a project failure. It is obvious that a recommended policy should be feasible. Indeed, it is the objective of the CCCD project, i.e., "Rio Convention obligations are being better implemented through improved policies, capacities, and awareness". Furthermore, the Project Board is the highest authority involved in the implementation of the project.
Limited coordination	Limited coordination between institutions and stakeholders is a barrier that the project has to overcome. As such, it cannot be defined neither as an assumption nor as a risk.
Members of the technical committees will be comprised of proactive experts and project champions	Project management should make sure to have good technical committees. They are part of the project.
Education module will be popular with teachers, students, and their parents	The capacity of the project to involve its beneficiaries (teacher, students, and their parents) in its activities is a challenge of the project itself. Their lack of engagement with the project would prove that the project is not relevant to them

The element "limited numbers of experts in the field who might be available to undertake the specific task" are, instead, a relevant risk that the project could have faced during its implementation.

4.1.c. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design

It was reported to the TE Team that the idea to work with a micro watershed approach is a lesson learned originated from a previous UNDP project, "Strengthening Community Based Forest and Watershed Management," funded by the GEF under its replenishment cycle n° 4. No mention of lessons learned incorporated into project design is available in the ProDoc. Finally, the project "National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) for Environmental Management", implemented by UNDP and financed by the GEF under its replenishment cycle n° 3 provided identified priority thematic issues that cut across the Rio Conventions at country level, i.e., deforestation, land, coastal and marine degradation, and drought and floods. In particular, the degradation of land and watersheds, at the core of the CCCD Project, is accelerating because of growing population, urbanization, unsustainable use of natural capital, climate change, weak governance, limited transparency in procedures, and lack of inclusive decision making processes.



4.1.d. Planned stakeholder participation

The TE Team confirmed with all stakeholders met, with the exception of a couple of them, that they did not indeed participate in the identification phase of the project. Consequently, their perspectives were not necessarily included in the project design.

The ProDoc does not plan in detail the stakeholder participation. It reports, “*...stakeholder involvement plan will be developed at project inception by including more specific engagement strategy based on selected project sites....*”

4.1.e. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

CCCD project did not establish any linkages with other interventions in the country.

4.1.f. Gender responsiveness of project design

The gender dimension of natural resource management is explicitly mentioned in many parts of the ProDoc. Nevertheless, the project design does not include any suggestion on how to address gender issues. Gender is completely absent in the formulations of objectives, outcomes, and outputs of the Results Framework, which represents the main M&E tool included in the ProDoc. Furthermore, no indicator has a gender dimension with the exception of indicator 2.4.3 which refers to gender balance between the participants for trainings to improve the M&E capacities of Indonesia public officers. Consequently, the project budget reflects no financial investments contributing to gender equality. In this regard, the annex to the ProDoc, Project Monitoring Quality Assurance, specifies, “*...There is no budget allocation made to specifically address gender equality as gender inequality does not represent a barrier to meeting Rio Convention obligations. The GEF Instrument also clearly states the criteria for the use of GEF financial resources, and these must be directed to activities that deliver global environmental benefits as defined under the three Rio Conventions for which the GEF is the financial mechanism...*”

Furthermore, the ProDoc does not include neither any Gender Markers. Actually, it is mentioned that UNDP gender markers will be tracked at the time of project initiation.

Finally, it was not possible for the TE Team to verify if and what kind of gender expertise was used in design the ProDoc. None of the interviewees was able to provide information in this regard.

The evaluation exercise considers almost null the gender responsiveness of project design, which ultimately does not provide any guidance for project implementation on gender issues. This constitutes a very important negative aspect of the design: in fact, the gender analysis, included in the ProDoc, identified women and children as vulnerable groups to the impact of deforestation and biodiversity loss.

4.1.g. Social and Environmental Safeguards

The SESP annexed to the ProDoc did not identify environmental and social (human rights and gender issues) risks. It stated that “*there are no environmental or social risks related to this project*”. The TE exercise confirms that there are not significant environmental or social risks related to the implementation of the initiative.

4.2. Project Implementation

4.2.a. Adaptive Management

The implementation of the project did not envisage any change in its design, decided and formalized during sessions of the Project Board.

In fact, the CCCD project was implemented according to its original design visualized in its Results Framework. Indeed, the quality of the framework (please refer to the section “4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators” for details) was very poor, and a



reformulation of its outcomes, outputs, and indicators was not possible: too many changes would have been necessary.

The Project Board acknowledged the recommendations included in the MTR and put in place actions to implement them in the remaining period of the project. The recommendations, however, did not entail any substantial changes to the Results Framework. As mentioned earlier, too many changes would have been necessary.

The project focused mainly on the achievements at local level, while the national dimension of the project, especially in regard to outcome 1, was led by MoEF with its own funds. This decision is not reported in any project document, including Project Boards minutes. Consequently, the PMU was left in charge mainly of the implementation of activities at field level in the two districts of Pasawaran (Lampung Province) and Malang (East Java Province).

4.2.b. Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements

CCCD project had a holistic approach at the field level. All relevant stakeholders, beneficiaries, communities, local authorities, and a private company, were involved in a participatory way in the implementation of activities. The project resulted to be very adherent to local needs and community driven.

Instead, at national level, MoEF led activities with its own resource and without an actual coordination with UNDP, as mentioned in the previous section.

4.2.c. Project Finance and Co-finance

The project funds were release to accomplished the activities related to the three outcomes of the projects. It is important to highlight that project funds were spent to implement activities mainly in the two project districts.

Project finance table (consolidated as per 31st December 2020)

Year	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Project Management	Total
2016	0	0	0	3.034	3.034
2017	69.457	42.171	41.915	23.334	176.877
2018	96.702	277.730	112.148	54.028	540.608
2019	97.697	265.835	125.238	32.777	521.547
2020	195.375	25.903	205.248	29.204	455.730
2021	---	---	---	---	182.204
Actual	459.231	611.639	484.549	142.377	1.697.796
Budget	570.000	535.000	605.000	170.000	1.880.000
Balance	110.769	-76.639	120.451	27.623	182.204

It was reported to the TE Team, that in the period 2015-21, MoEF allocated 790.6 billion of Indonesian Rupiah (around 5.5 million USD) to the implementation of activities that had a strong link with the objective of the CCCD project “To strengthen targeted legal and regulatory frameworks as well as economic incentives to meet global environmental outcomes through sustainable watershed management”:

- Community participation for implementation of watershed management activities via Watershed Management Coordination Forum;
- Capacity development of human resource in the Directorate and the Central Management of Watersheds through technical training;



- Data and information availability as well as institutional capacity building including reporting mechanism of provincial institutions.

MoEF complied with its co-finance commitment to the project. However, these activities were not coordinate with the implementation of the CCCD project. A cofinancing table was not provided to Evaluation Team.

4.2.d. Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, overall assessment of M&E

The Project's M&E plan has foreseen all the relevant elements for the purpose:

- The Results Framework as the main monitoring tool,
- Three milestones included in the project evaluation plan, i.e., an inception report, a mid-term review, and this terminal evaluation.

The quality of the Results Framework was extremely poor: its formulation was redundant, outcomes did not have indicators, and objective's indicators were not smart.

The TE values the **M&E design at entry** of the project as **Highly Unsatisfactory**.

The daily monitoring of the implementation progress has been as designed in the ProDoc. The PMU had the responsibility of monitoring the Project.

To monitor regularly the implementation, CCCD project made use of the two common UNDP tools:

- Quarterly Monitoring Reports, drafted by the PMU and approved by UNDP (M&E Officer and Quality Assurance and Reporting Unit within the UNDP-CO.
- Project Implementation Reports (PIR).

The contribution of MoEF included in the letter of commitment, signed prior project approval, could not be monitored.

PMU and UNDP staff did a good job in implementing and document all project activities related to outcomes 2 and 3.

The main problem in terms of M&E was represented by the poor quality of the Results Framework included in the ProDoc. As mentioned in section "4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators," the framework did not provide any proper guidance applicable for project management.

The TE values the **M&E Plan Implementation** of the project as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

Although the Project National Manager took part to a certain extent in the activities implemented by MoEF to achieve outcome 1, these activities were fully out of the supervision of UNDP. MoEF independently implemented them with its own funds. These activities were not reported in the PIRs and as such project staff and UNDP could monitor them.

The PMU was in charge of both implementation and monitoring the activities. As such, there was no dedicated budget for M&E activities, with the exemption of the MTR and the present evaluation exercise. M&E complied with relevant requirements GEF standards. PIRs were completed with financial tracking progress, and GEF GEFinformed. As mentioned, activities related to outcome 1 were not reported.

The TE values the **Overall Quality of M&E** of the project as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**.



4.2.e. UNDP implementation/oversight, Implementing Partner execution and overall assessment of implementation/oversight and execution

This project was implemented within the context of the United Nations Partnership for Development Framework (UNPDF) for 2011-2015 and the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2014-2017.

The project was implemented according to UNDP's support to the National Implementation Modality (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Focal Point for the UNCBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC, and GEF).

Being the GEF Implementing Agency, UNDP Country Office had a specific project assurance and oversight role with overall accountability and responsibility for the delivery of results to the GEF.

UNDP implementation/oversight of the project was smooth and effective. However, its oversight over project activities did not result fully. The choice of MoEF to lead independently the activities related to outcome 1 was not fully understood by UNDP. Actually, it was not reported.

The TE values the **Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight** of the project as **Satisfactory**.

The evaluation exercise considers as fully legitimate the choice of MoEF to lead independently the activities related to outcome 1. The lack of reporting documents related to the choice is instead not fully understandable. It is also represented a mistake/distraction from the side of the Project National Manager. She was actually involved in the process, but she did not report about it.

The lack of reporting documents is a concern in terms of accountability.

The TE values the **Quality of Implementing Partner Execution** of the project as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

The TE values the **Overall quality of Implementation/Execution** of the project as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

4.2.f. Risk Management

No major social, environmental, financial, operational, organizational, political, regulatory, strategic, and security risks that emerged or evolved during project implementation. Nor was it identified in the ProDoc. The implementation of activities did not face any problems related to the underestimation of risks.



4.3. Project Results and Impacts

4.3.a. Progress towards objective and expected outcomes

Project objective - To strengthen targeted legal and regulatory frameworks as well as economic incentives to meet global environmental outcomes through sustainable watershed management.

Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
1. Strengthened policy, legislative, and economic instruments for improved implementation of the Rio Conventions and SLM/SWM.	Rio Convention obligations are being better implemented through improved policies, capacities, and awareness.	Due to the lack of discernible differences between output indicators and those within the same component, but higher up the Results Framework (please refer to the section “4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators”), it can be stated that the strengthening of policy, legislative and economic for improved implementation of the Rio Conventions happened. However, it is only in part attributable to the implementation of the project as per outcome 1.
2. Institutional and technical capacities are strengthened for enhanced to mainstream SLM/SWM and Rio Conventions within national development frameworks.	2. There is an increase in coordination between government groups and other stakeholders, and SLM/SWM is strengthened through improved mandates, capacities, and models.	Again, due to the lack of discernible differences between output indicators and those within the same component, but higher up the Results Framework (please refer to the section “4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators”), it can be stated that the strengthening of institutional and technical capacities happened. Actually, this represents the main outcome of the project.
3. Awareness and environmental education on the linkages between Rio Conventions and national sustainable development objectives.	3. There is an increase in the appreciation of the Rio Conventions among the general public.	The general awareness of Rio Conventions increased both at a project community level and within the public institutions. However, such an increase cannot be measured because the project did not make use of any indicators in this regard.

The project objective is considered only partially achieved.

Although a better integration of the Rio Conventions is accommodated in the National Mid Term Development Planning (RPJMN),

For most of the stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation, the CCCD is a first step to strengthen the commitment of Indonesia towards more effective implementation of the three Rio Conventions, i.e., Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change UNFCCC.

The micro watershed approach as natural elements was appreciated by all stakeholders as a practical way to increase the coordination between stakeholders at the district level.

The work of the MoEF conducted independently by the institution with other funds, not belonging to the GEF. Moreover, the PIRs do not report against the achievement of MoEF. However, the National Project Manager was involved as a technical person in the process led by MoEF.



Outcome 1 - Strengthened policy, legislative, and economic instruments		
Output 1.1. - Targeted policies, legal and regulatory instruments are amended (strengthened)		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
1.1.1. Assessment of the current policy and legal framework	<p>1.1.1 Current policy and legal framework are assessed</p> <p><i>1.1.1.1 The three (3) in-depth thematic analyses (CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC) of Indonesia's environmental governance are drafted</i></p> <p><i>1.1.1.2 The analytical report that synthesizes all three Rio Conventions is drafted and endorsed</i></p> <p><i>1.1.1.3 Expert working groups draft policy recommendations</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>The Project Board approved two reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Study on Landscape Management of the Way Khilau Micro Watershed. • Landscape Governance Study in the Sumberbulu Micro Watershed. <p>The reports are actually about two micro watersheds areas in Lampung and Malang (Sumberbulu and Way Khilau). They are studies of the geographical landscape of the two watersheds. The legal and policy dimension is limited to mentioning the following policies and laws:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government Regulation 37/2012 • Ministry of Forestry Regulation P.60/2013 • Law 37/2014 • Ministerial Regulation 67/ Menhut-II/2014 • Law 32/2004 <p>The thematic analyses on CBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC were not included in the study. However, there is a mention about how to implement the Rio Conventions at project level.</p> <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>The assessment of the current policy and legal framework at the national level was done. Personnel from the CCCD project was involved during the process.</p> <p>The legal and policy dimension is mentioning the following policies and laws:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 5 of 1994 • Law 19 of 2004 • Law 4 of 2006 • Presidential Regulation 59 of 2017 • Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry P.105 / MENLHK / SETJEN / KUM.1 / 12/2018 <p>National draft policy recommendations related to biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change has approved and accommodated in the Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 18 of 2020, especially in Annexe 1 Chapter 7 and Annexe 2 Number 36.</p>



		<p>The indicator's target level was achieved, but it is only very partially attributable to the CCCD project. The project, in fact, did not inform the assessment of the current policy and legal framework at the national level. However, the National Project Manager was involved in the process that led to the formulation of the assessment and consultants hired by the project. Instead, the district level's achievement is considered a preliminary work to implement activities related to outcome 2.</p>
<p>1.1.2. Assessment of information and knowledge needs of social actors and other stakeholders that can play a role in catalyzing Rio Convention implementation</p>	<p>1.1.2. Assessment report is drafted and peer reviewed, endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop and finalized and subsequently approved by Project Board finalized</p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>The assessment of information and knowledge needs is included in two reports for each micro watersheds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2019-2023 Way Khilau micro watershed management plan and the Way Khilau micro watershed Management Coordination Forum Decree. • The spatial-based Sumberbulu micro watershed Management Plan for 2019-2023 and the Sumberbulu micro watershed Management Coordination Forum Decree. <p>The formulation of a Micro Watershed Management plan was carried out by taking into account biophysical, institutional, and economic conditions. The formulation also considers the stakeholders, potencies, problems, and impact assessment related to the watershed, biodiversity, and biomass. The formulation is presented in a matrix containing problems, programs, targets, target achievements for 5 years from 2019-2023, the person in charge of the activity, and the supporting parties.</p> <p>At national level, an assessment of information and knowledge needs of social actors and other stakeholders was not carried out.</p> <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>A coordination meeting was held in the form of a "Focus Group Discussion (FGD) on Global Targets and Commitments to Conventions and International Cooperation" on 25-26 February 2021. The FGD invited the participation of the parties dealing with environmental conventions and international agreements. Important notes from the FGD report include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synergy is not only needed between the Rio Conventions, i.e., CBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD, but also in other international conventions and agreements related to chemicals, sea, water (freshwater), and agriculture. • It is necessary to get to a common understanding on the way forward of the different conventions and agreements that will be used as guidance for Indonesia in discussing



		<p>various issues in various international fora forums. In addition, it is necessary to strengthen coordination between Ministries / Agencies, strengthen the capacity of personnel in compiling national reports that will become material for global negotiations, and review the targets and indicators for each global commitment.</p> <p>MoEF led the process without the utilization of project funds. It was not a process led by the project itself. However, during the meeting, results achieved in Malang and Pesawaran of the CCCD project were presented.</p> <p>The FGD report can be used as basic information for the stakeholders to map the similarities and overlapping targets, efforts, indicators, which must be achieved at the national level. In the end, it can be taken into consideration in preparing Indonesia's official stand during the various international meetings/conferences related to international conventions and agreements. However, the report does not constitute an assessment of information and knowledge needs of social actors and other stakeholders that can play a role in catalyzing Rio Convention implementation</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was not achieved. Instead, the district level's achievement is considered a preliminary work to implement activities related to outcome 2.</p>
1.1.3. Formulated and approved Operational guidelines, and any other policy, legislative, or regulatory instrument amended	<p>1.1.3 Appropriate guidelines are formulated and approved or regulatory instrument amended</p> <p><i>1.1.3.1 Legislative and regulatory instruments are drafted</i></p> <p><i>1.1.3.2 Operational guidelines drafted, peer reviewed by independent experts, finalized, and validated through stakeholder workshop</i></p> <p><i>1.1.3.3 Policy recommendations to legitimize these guidelines, as appropriate, are prepared, submitted, approved by the Project Board</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>Operational Guidelines were developed and approved by Project Board</p> <p>The guidelines, however, did not propose and legislative and/or regulatory instruments at national level. They are about the implementation of the CCCD project in Malang and Pesawaran.</p> <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>MoEF issued a Regulation P.7 / MENLHK / SETJEN / KUM.1 / 2/2018 through which the CCCD guidelines were legitimized for assessing vulnerability, risk, and the impact of climate change at national, province, district, sub-district, and village.</p> <p>The land and forest rehabilitation assessment, included in the project Micro Watershed Management Plans, was used as input to inform the following national regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry P.105 of 2018 • Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry P.2 / MENLHK / SETJEN / KUM.1 /1/2020.



		The target level of the indicator was achieved. CCCD project informed the redaction of the regulation with its Micro Watershed Management Plans. The achievement reported at the district level is considered a preliminary work to implement activities related to outcome 2.
Output 1.1. was achieved partially (2 out of 3 indicators' target level fulfilled). It is only partially attributable to the CCCD project. Instead, the work done by the CCCD project was substantial to achieve the local dimension of the indicators: it is the preliminary work to implement outcome 2.		
Output 1.2. - Best practice economic instruments developed		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
1.2.1. Feasibility study on financial and economic instruments	<p>1.2.1 Feasibility study on financial and economic instruments is undertaken</p> <p><i>1.2.1.1 Expert working group is made up of at least 20 rotating members</i></p> <p><i>1.2.1.2 Convene expert working group to review recommendations of institutional reforms. Expert working group presents a consensus agreement on prioritized recommendations</i></p> <p><i>1.2.1.3 Undertake an analysis of the economic instruments at the national and provincial levels to identify challenges and barriers to Rio Convention implementation from an Indonesian context, drafted, peer-reviewed, and completed</i></p> <p><i>1.2.1.4 Convene a working group of relevant experts and conduct stakeholder meetings to discuss findings of the</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>Two studies were conducted at local level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-Economic and Gender Mainstreaming at SUB Watershed of MDM Sumberbulu - East Java. Social, Economy, and Gender Mainstreaming Analysis Way Khilau Watershed. <p>Both reports examine the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-Economic and Gender Aspect Conditions Related to the Watershed Management The Role of Social Capital in Biodiversity Land Management and External Change Gender Mainstreaming Related to the Gender Role in The Provision of Household Necessities Changes in Attitudes and Knowledge of the Community on the CCCD Project Intervention Indicators and Recommendations for Socio-Economic and Gender Mainstreaming <p>The reports focused on the CCCD project and actually constituted the feasibility assessment for the CCCD activities at field level. The report, however, is not a feasibility study on financial and economic instruments, which are not mentioned in it.</p> <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>A feasibility study on the financial and economic instruments was finalized, approved, and accommodated in the planning document of Bappenas 2019-2024: 1) Macroeconomics Analysis in Indonesia 2015-2018, 2) Indonesia's Economic Challenges for 2020-2024, and 3) Indonesia's Macroeconomic Goals 2020-2024.</p>



	<p><i>analysis of economic instruments.</i></p> <p><i>1.2.1.5 The drafting of a feasibility study on financial and economic instruments to advance the UNCCCD/SLM/SWM, with the first draft available. It is endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop, finalized and approved by Project Board</i></p>	<p>Studies related to the circular economy, sustainable production, and consumption to achieve the SDGs-sustainable development goals were carried out by the Research, Development and Innovation Agency / Chair of the SDGs Working Group, Ministry of Environment and Forestry.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved, but it is not attributable to the CCCD project. CCCD-project did not inform the feasibility study on the financial and economic instruments done by MoEF. It just informed the studies on circular economy and sustainable production.</p>
1.2.2. Resource mobilization strategy	<p>1.2.2. Resource Mobilization strategy is drafted</p> <p><i>1.2.2.1. Expert working group reviews and guides the revision and finalization of the resource mobilization strategy, which is presented to a donors' round-table</i></p> <p><i>1.2.2.2. Resource mobilization strategy approved by Project Board and proposed to Rio Convention focal points</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>Four documents were drafted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of CCCD Project Micro-Grants. • CCCD Project Action Plan Strategy 2019-2020. • The CCCD Project's Spatial-based Micro Watershed Management Plan. • Monitoring and Evaluation of the CCCD project. <p>The four documents are all about how to implement the project at the field level.</p> <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>Forest area that the community can manage under a social forestry scheme was regulated in the Decree of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry SK.744 / MENLHK-PKTL / REN / PLA.0 / 1/2019 which include the Forestry Partnership (KK) program or Forestry Partnership Protection Recognition and Social Forestry Forest Utilization Permits. The Forestry Partnership program is a national instrument for funding sustainable community forest management.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was not achieved. The project contributed to the Forestry Partnership program: the partnership agreements signed in the frame of the CCCD project by beneficiaries (working groups) and MoEF at district level were taken as examples to inform the program's design. The Forestry Partnership program cannot be considered a resource mobilization strategy.</p>



Output 1.2. was partially achieved. It is only partially attributable to the CCCD project.

Instead, the work done by the CCCD project was substantial to achieve the local dimension of the indicators: it is the preliminary work to implement outcome 2.

Output 1.3. - SLM mainstreamed into development policies/strategies

Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
1.3.1. Analytical framework	<p>1.3.1. Analytical framework is developed</p> <p><i>1.3.1.1. Analytical framework is drafted and peer reviewed</i></p> <p><i>1.3.1.2. The in-depth thematic reviews of Indonesia's existing national development strategies (strategic plan of relevant Ministries/Agencies) and Rio Convention action plans are completed</i></p> <p><i>1.3.1.3. Expert Working Groups (WG) are established and agreed Project Board</i></p> <p><i>1.3.1.4. WG will review and discuss the findings of the analyses of systemic and institutional capacities as well as the institutional assessments</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>The information is included in the following reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Study on Landscape Management of the Way Khilau Micro Watershed. • Landscape Governance Study in the Sumberbulu Micro Watershed. <p>The reports are actually about two micro watersheds areas in Lampung and Malang (Sumberbulu and Way Khilau).</p> <p>There is a mention about how to implement Rio Conventions at the project level.</p> <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>The information is included in Indonesia's Sixth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Natrep VI). The Natrep VI contains information about the progress of Indonesia's achievement in meeting the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABTs), including: information on targets at the national level; implementation steps are taken and assessment of effectiveness associated with obstacles, scientific, and technical needs to achieve national targets; assessment of progress towards each national target; national contribution in the achievement of each ABTs; national contribution in achieving the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) target; and updating the national biodiversity profile.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved, but it is not attributed to the CCCD project. The project, in fact, did not inform the Natrep VI report.</p>
1.3.2. Sustainable Water Management (SWM) model	<p>1.3.2. SWM model(s) are conceptualized and developed</p> <p><i>1.3.2. 1. SWM models for mainstreaming Rio Conventions are formulated through learning-by-doing workshops; and Models are independently peer reviewed</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>SWM models are conceptualized and developed in four documents/reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of the Biophysical / Characteristics of the "Way Khilau Micro Watershed" of Pesawaran District, Lampung Province. • Identification of the "Way Khilau Way Micro Watershed" in Pesawaran District, Lampung Province.



	<p><i>1.3.2. 2. Undertake a targeted study of best policy tools for linkages among SLM, SWM, Rio Convention National Action Plans, and development policies/strategies, drafted</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of Biophysical / Characteristics of "Sumberbulu Micro Watershed" Malang Regency, East Java Province. • Identification of the institution "DAS Mikro Sumberbulu" Malang Regency, East Java Province. <p>The SWM models included institutional and coordination mechanisms and the compilation of the two watersheds' biophysical and geographical characteristics.</p> <p><i>National level</i> An institutional assessment for protected forest rehabilitation and a policy brief according to sustainable watershed management was legitimized in the Regulation of the Director-General of Watershed and Protected Forest Control P.4/PDASHL/SET/KUM.1/7/2018 based on the micro watershed approach promoted by the project.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator is achieved. The model promoted by the CCCD project was conceptualized, developed, and included in national regulation.</p>
1.3.3 Roadmap	1.3.3 Roadmap is approved by the Project Board.	<p><i>District level</i> A CCCD Project Action Plan Strategy 2019-2020 was draft. The strategy was formulated with the aim of supporting the implementation of the CCCD project. It is an internal management tool of the project. It is not a roadmap to mainstream SLM into development policies/strategies at the national level.</p> <p><i>National level</i> Action Plan Strategy of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry was agreed upon from 2020 to 2024. It legitimizes in the Regulation of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry P.16 / MENLHK / SETJEN / SET.1 / 8/2020.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved, but it is not attributed to the CCCD project. The project did not inform the MoEF Action Plan Strategy.</p>
<p>Output 1.3. was partially achieved, but it is not fully attributable to the CCCD project.</p> <p>CCCD project did contribute to the conceptualization and development of the Sustainable Water Management (SWM) model.</p> <p>The work done by the CCCD project was substantial to achieve the local dimension of the indicators: it is the preliminary work to implement outcome 2.</p>		



Output 1.4. - Strengthen institutional mechanisms for improved coordination and collaboration		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
1.4.1. Strengthen institutional mechanisms for improved coordination and collaboration	1.4.1. Strengthen fora on SLM and mainstreaming SLM into regional and national policy programmes. These fora should meet at least twice a year on priority issues.	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>In each micro watershed, there is a coordination forum on mainstreaming SLM into programmes. The members (60 in Lampung and 40 in Malang) of the forum meet twice per year. The fora are based on four main documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2019-2023 Way Khilau micro watershed management plan and the Way Khilau micro watershed Management Coordination Forum Decree. • The spatial-based Sumberbulu micro watershed Management Plan for 2019-2023 and the Sumberbulu micro watershed Management Coordination Forum Decree. • Decree of the Malang Regent regarding the 2019-2023 Sumberbulu Micro Watershed Model Management Coordination Forum. • Decree of the Regent of Pesawaran concerning the Formation of the Management of the Micro Watershed Model Management Forum for Way Khilau District 2019-2024. <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>There is a watershed coordination forum based on the Decree of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry SK.495 / MENLHK / SETJEN / KUM.1 / 7/2019. This forum consists of a board of experts with various backgrounds to support watershed management that is cross-disciplinary and cross-sectoral. This forum has the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing input to the government in formulating policies, planning programs, implementing activities, and controlling watershed management activities • Assisting the government in supporting integrated watershed management • Facilitating coordination, integration, synchronization, and synergy to align sector interests, between regions and between disciplines and among stakeholders in watershed management • Coordinating and facilitating regional watershed forums in carrying out the tasks of the watershed forums in their respective regions • Accommodating and channelling community aspirations in watershed management to various interested parties <p>The indicator's target level was achieved, but it is very partially attributed to the CCCD project. The project provided the idea to involve relevant stakeholders in the fora.</p>



<p>1.4.2. New or improved consultative and decision-making institutional mechanism</p>	<p>1.4.2. Institutional mechanism for consultative and decision-making process are improved and approved</p> <p><i>1.4.2.1. Review existing institutional framework on coordination mechanism for implementation of Rio Conventions</i></p> <p><i>1.4.2.2. Needs report drafted, endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop⁸, and finalized and subsequently approved by Project Board</i></p> <p><i>1.4.2.3. Learning-by-doing workshops formulate a new or improved best practical consultative and decision-making institutional mechanism</i></p> <p><i>1.4.1.4. New or improved consultative and decision-making institutional mechanism is approved by Project Board</i></p>	<p><i>District level</i></p> <p>The institutional mechanism for consultative and decision-making processes is improved and approved at the local level in the project communities.</p> <p>To institutionalize the consultative and decision-making process, four documents were drafted and approved by MoEF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval and direction for the conservation partnership of the "Alam Asri" tourism awareness group in Bromo Tengger Semeru National Park. • Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry regarding the recognition and protection of forestry partnerships between the "Cirompang Lestari" forest farmer group and the Regional Technical Implementation Unit of the Pesawaran Forest Management Unit in Bayas Jaya Village. • Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry regarding the recognition and protection of forestry partnerships between the "Cirompang Jaya" forest farmer group and the Regional Technical Implementation Unit of the Pesawaran Forest Management Unit in Bayas Jaya Village. • Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry regarding the recognition and protection of forestry partnerships between "Indah Jaya" forest farmer groups and the Regional Technical Implementation Unit of the Pesawaran Forest Management Unit in Bayas Jaya Village. <p><i>National level</i></p> <p>The program of the forum is:</p> <p>Providing input on the draft of the National Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2020-2024 related to watershed management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory of problems and suggestions related to watershed • Providing input to strategic government programs nationally, including integrated watershed management, priority watershed/lake management, and operationalization of environmental service values in watershed management • To facilitate the coordination of regional watershed coordination forums at least once a year <p>The indicator's target level was achieved, but it is only partially attributable to the CCCD project. The National Project Manager was involved in the process that led to the formulation of</p>
--	--	--



		the assessment. Instead, the achievement reported at district level is considered as preliminary work to implement activities related to outcome 2.
1.4.3. Draft of Liaison protocols among partner agencies	1.4.3. Liaison protocols among partner agencies are drafted and approved	Liaison protocols among partner agencies are not included in any document available at the time of the present evaluation exercise. The target level of the indicator was not achieved.

Output 1.4. was achieved, but it is not attributable to the CCCD project.

Outcome 1 is considered partially achieved, but it is only partially attributable to the CCCD project.

Most of the activities to produce the outputs related to outcome 1 were not implemented by CCCD Project. MoEF implemented them autonomously. The ministry led the process without the utilization of project funds. It was not a process led by the project itself. Therefore, the TE Team mentioned, whenever it is significant, the CCCD project's contribution to work done by the MoEF.

In this regard, it is important to highlight that the MoEF activities were not mentioned in any documents at the TE Team's disposal. The minutes of PB meetings did not report about this separation of tasks between the CCCD project and MoEF. Furthermore, the Project Implementation Reviews did not report these activities. The activities implemented by MoEF were neither implemented nor monitored by the project.

Outcome 2 - Strengthened institutional and individual capacities to mainstream SLM/SWM

Output 2.1. - Priority SWM selected from 15 national priorities watersheds and feasibility study conducted

Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
2.1.1. Selected SWM pilot sites through broad stakeholder consultations	2.1.1 Stakeholder consultations result in the final selection of maximum three priority watersheds in which to carry out project activities approved by Project Board	Two project sites were selected as micro watershed management models as per the following decrees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decree of the "Brantas Sampean" Protection Forest and Watershed Management Agency regarding the micro watershed model's location associated with the CCCD project. Decree of the "Way Seputih Way Sekampung" Watershed and Protection Forest Management Agency regarding the micro watershed model's location associated with the CCCD project. The target level of the indicator was achieved.
2.1.2. Feasibility study and activities to be piloted	2.1.2. Feasibility study and activities to be piloted is	2.1.2 Several studies (13) were conducted in the project sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study on Socio-Economics and Gender in Sub-Das Way Khilau,



	<p>completed. The study include review of existing watershed management plans at project site(s). This activity should be initiated by developing watershed-map with scale of 1:50,000. This study also contains procedures for accessing best practice guidance and methodologies, and the collaborative approach to planning and Rio Convention mainstreaming.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-Das Bulok, Das Sekampung, Provinsi Lampung • Climate Change Assessment In Khilau Sub-Sub Watershed, Bulok Sub Watershed, Sekampung Watershed, Lampung Province • Study Of Institutional Capacity Development In Sub Sub Watershed Khilau • Study Of Ecosystem Biodiversity In Sub-Sub Watershed Khilau Sub-Watershed Bulok Watershed Sekampung • Biophysics Study, Carbon Stock, And Biodiversity • Landuse Planning In The Bangsri Micro Watershed East Java • Deliverable 1 Natural Resources Management • Public Policy Study On Way Khilau Micro Watershed Management Bayas Jaya Village, Way Khilau District, Pesawaran District, Lampung Province • Land And Water Conservation Study In Sub Sub Das Khilau • Natural Resources Management Of Bangsri Micro- Watershed • Climate Change Adaptation And Mitigation In The Bangsri Micro Watershed-East Java • Biophysical Characteristics, Vegetation, Biomass, Carbon Stock And Carbon Sequestration In The Bangsri Micro Watershed-East Java • Social Economic And Gender In The Bangsri Micro Watershed • The target level of the indicator was achieved. • <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
Output 2.1. was achieved. The project did achieve all target levels of indicators.		
Output 2.2. - Pilot activities to mainstream Rio Conventions into SWM at selected sites		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
2.2.1. Report with recommended revisions to institutional arrangements	2.2.1. Institutional arrangement revisions are recommended within a report	<p>Institutional arrangement revisions have been convened by workshop based on micro watershed management plans (20 working groups in Lampung and 7 in Malang)</p> <p>The project produced 27 reports on the working groups (one per each working group). Each report included the structure and organization of each working group. The working groups drafted each report.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
2.2.2. Selected exercises piloted at project sites	2.2.2. Selected exercises are piloted at project sites	<p>Selected exercises were piloted at project sites</p> <p><i>Selected exercises piloted sites in Lampung Province and East Java Province</i></p>



	<p>2.2.2.1. <i>Selected exercises piloted at a maximum of three watersheds</i></p> <p>2.2.2.2. <i>Women's participation is accommodated</i></p>	<p><i>Women's participation is accommodated through the establishment of 8 women's group, 6 in Lampung and 2 in Malang</i></p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
2.2.3. Lessons learned report prepared on CCCD/SLM/SWM activities	2.2.3 Lessons learned report prepared on CCCD/SLM/SWM activities	<p>Lessons learned report is not available.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
Output 2.2. was achieved. The project did achieve the two most important indicators related to the output. The lessons learned report is under preparation.		
Output 2.3 - Training programme on improved methodologies and analytical skills		
2.3.1. Training needs assessment report and comprehensive training plan	2.3.1. Needs report drafted, endorsed by stakeholders at a validation workshop, finalized and subsequently approved by Project Board	<p>A report on training needs was not available. The project compiled only a file of the recapitulation of planning for working group training for 2019-2020 in Bringin Village and Bambang Village. The file consisted of the name of the group, type of training, training target, resource person, number of training, and time of implementation.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was not achieved.</p>
2.3.2. Training modules drafted, reviewed, and finalized	2.3.2 Training modules drafted, reviewed, and finalized	<p>2.3.2. The following 17 training modules were prepared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infographic training. • SWAT hydrological model training • Training on the potential of biodiversity and local wisdom in Pesawaran. • Watershed training, conditions, and efforts for Forest and Land Rehabilitation / Soil and Water Conservation, Pesawaran. • Technical guidance training for agrosilvopastoral feed making and goat livestock pens, Pesawaran. • Technical guidance training for goat farming, Pesawaran. • Training in developing tourism villages through Village-Owned Enterprises, Malang. • Training on the roles and functions of tourism awareness groups, Malang. • Tour package arrangement training, Malang. • Training on local microorganism production, Malang.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on bird conservation as a counterweight to the ecosystem, Malang. • Training of birds protected by the government, Malang. • Training on bird watching and how to quickly identify birds, Malang. • Soil and mixed plantation health training as a strategy in anticipating the impacts of climate change and biodiversity conservation, Malang. • Agroforestry training as an offer of land management techniques for micro watershed health, Malang. • Agricultural pest training, Malang. • Training on patchwork, ribbon embroidery, and pastries, Malang. <p>The content of each training was tailored to the needs of the related working group.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
2.3.3. Training implementation	2.3.3. Training programme implemented in accordance to the training plan	<p>2.3.3 17 training modules were implemented. Trainings were conducted through the collaboration of communities, PMU, local authorities, and consultants.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
Output 2.3. was substantially achieved, although the project did not achieve all indicators, just 2 out of 3.		
Output 2.4 - Improved monitoring and evaluation frameworks to measure and facilitate compliance		
2.4.1. Analysis of monitoring and evaluation needs	2.4.1. Analysis of monitoring and evaluation needs drafted, independently peer-reviewed	See indicator 2.4.2.
2.4.2. M&E frameworks finalized	2.4.2. Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks finalized and approved.	<p>The monitoring and evaluation handbook has been finalized “Monitoring and Evaluation of Watershed / Sub-watershed Management at CCCD project sites in 2019-2020.” It is a guide for implementers in the field for monitoring and evaluation. It contains principles and criteria for watershed management, monitoring, and evaluation (land, water management, climate change, biodiversity, social, economic, and community gender).</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>



2.4.3 Training conducted for improved capacities of M&E of Rio Conventions	2.4.3. At least 80 government staff members that are directly implicated in the planning and decision-making process to monitor and enforce environmental legislation have participated in M&E workshops.	2.4.3. Monitoring and evaluation trainings for the Rio Conventions implementation through incentive mechanism in Lampung and Malang carried out with a collaboration with local government. 90 government staff participated in the M&E workshop. An approximately 40% of them were women. The target level of the indicator was achieved.
Output 2.4. was fully achieved		
Output 2.5 - Strengthened SLM/SWM institutional mandates		
2.5.1 Recommended revisions to institutional mandates	2.5.1. Report with recommended revisions to institutional mandates, validated by stakeholders, and approved by the Project Board	The two project Micro Watershed Management Plans include recommendations for the local stakeholders to implement SWM/SLM practises. However, the revision of institutional mandates did not happen. The target level of the indicator was achieved.
2.5.2. Recommendations to job descriptions, terms of references, and procedures of regional Government authorities	2.5.2. Recommendations to job descriptions, terms of references, and procedures of relevant government authorities are complete, revised and validated by stakeholders and approved by the Project Board	The two project Micro Watershed Management Plans did include the information as per the indicator. The target level of the indicator was achieved.
2.5.3 Financial sustainability strategies	2.5.3. Financial sustainability strategies are drafted, independently peer reviewed, revised and validated, and approve	2.5.3. A consultant conducted a study, i.e., "Malang Micro-grant Market Analysis". The report includes recommendations for standardization of product and packaging quality, product branding, and working groups' economic accountability. These recommendations are not relevant to measure the indicator's level of achievement, which is about financial strategies. The target level of the indicator was not achieved.
Output 2.5. was partially achieved. 2 out of 3 indicators were achieved		
Outcome 2 is considered achieved, and it is fully attributed to the project implementation.		



Outcome 3 - Improving awareness of global environmental values		
Output 3.1. - Stakeholder dialogues on the value of Rio Conventions		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
3.1.1 Survey on awareness	3.1.1 Awareness of the value of the environment as well as the Rio Conventions is increased	<p>An endline was conducted, including indicators on awareness, dissemination of information, partnership, and education in September 2020. It involved 19 officers from local authorities and 22 members of the working groups in the Malang district.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was not achieved. The number of people interview is not representative.</p>
3.1.2. Communication strategy and plan	3.1.2. Communication strategy and plan developed	<p>Guidelines for implementing the CCCD project communication strategy were drafted. Moreover, a manual on how to upload news and information on the CCCD website was written as well. The users of the two documents were the PMU and local authorities, and the target of the strategy was the CCCD project communities.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
3.1.3 Awareness of the value of the environment as well as the Rio Conventions is increased	<p>3.1.3. Awareness of the value of the environment, as well as the Rio Conventions, is increased</p> <p><i>3.1.3.1. Website and relevant social media presence and regularly updated</i></p> <p><i>3.1.3.2. At least five (5) media journalist visit project sites to promote SLM and SWM practices through media reportage</i></p> <p><i>3.1.3.3. Number of visits to the web pages relevant to the Rio Convention is increased by at least 10% over the baseline (prior to month 4 of project initiation)</i></p>	<p>3.1.3. Awareness of the value of the environment, as well as the Rio Conventions, is increased</p> <p><i>3.1.3.1. CCCD Project website and social media created and regularly updated (IG, Twitter, YouTube, Facebook)</i> https://cccd.id</p> <p><i>3.1.3.2. 13 journalists visited 2 project sites. 5 in Lampung and 8 in Malang</i></p> <p><i>3.1.3.3. Baseline visits in Instagram is 15 per post</i> <i>Endline visits on Instagram are 37. Therefore, there was an increase of 246%, but it is still very low.</i></p> <p><i>3.1.3.4. 40 publications on local and national newspapers</i></p> <p><i>3.1.3.5. Lessons learned from the report were not available during the evaluation exercise.</i></p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>



	<p><i>3.1.3.4. Reporting in the popular literature on SLM and SWM as well as monitoring of impact results in the context of the Rio Convention mainstreaming shows a 10% increase over forecasted trends using baseline data and past trends</i></p> <p><i>3.1.3.5. Lessons learned report prepared on targeted Rio Convention mainstreaming activities</i></p>	
Output 3.1 was substantially achieved, although the project did not achieve all indicators, just 2 out of 3.		
Output 3.2. - Brochures, bulletins, and articles on the Rio Conventions		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
3.2.1. Brochures, bulletins, and articles on SLM/SWM and the Rio Conventions that highlight the importance of the Rio Conventions and help individuals understand how their daily lives are impacted by the global environment	<p><i>3.2.1.1. At least 12 articles on the relevance of the new and innovative approaches for SLM and SWM will be written and published in popular literature with high circulation, and printed as brochures for distribution at special event.</i></p> <p><i>3.2.1.2. At least 24 articles and/or bulletins on the relevancy of the Rio Conventions to Indonesia's national socio-economic development will be written and published in popular literature with high circulation</i></p>	<p><i>3.2.1.1. 14 articles, 13 published on regional newspapers and online newspapers, and 1 published on a national newspaper (Media Indonesia).</i></p> <p><i>3.2.1.2. 40 publications on local and national newspapers</i></p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>



	<i>and printed as brochures for distribution for a special event.</i>	
Output 3.2 was achieved.		
Output 3.3: Public service announcement on environmentally friendly behaviour		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
3.3.1. Public Service Announcement (PSA) airings on television and radio that promote environmental information management as well as mainstreaming of Rio Conventions into socio-economic development.	<i>3.3.1.1. One PSA completed and broadcasted for radio and television: at least 5 airings of the PSA on television and at least 20 airings of the PSA on radio</i>	<p>3.3.1.2. Instagram (IG): 358 posts YouTube: 8 videos Facebook: 358 posts</p> <p>Note: The PSA switched from TV and Radio into social media posts (IG, Facebook, YouTube). The posts follow International Events, National Events, and CCCD Project's Activities, as this application is widely spread and easy to access by the public. Project Board had endorsed these changes.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
Output 3.3 was achieved.		
Output 3.4: Improved educational content and youth engagement		
Indicators	Target value	Progress at the end of the project
3.4.1. Education module for institutions on Rio Conventions mainstreaming.	3.4.1. Public education module on Rio Conventions mainstreaming completed and approved by the Project Board	<p>3.4.1. Two education modules (1 for Pasawaran and 1 for Malang) on Rio Conventions mainstreaming prepared and approved by the Project Board and implemented.</p> <p>The learning material was adjusted locally to make the learning experience more relevant as well as more familiar to students. With attractive illustrations and interactive content, this module was expected to increase students' awareness of the environment.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>
3.4.2. Environmental awareness module for secondary schools.	3.4.2. Education module prepared for secondary schools	<p>3.4.2. A module explaining the biodiversity in Sumberbulu micro watershed was drafted and approved by the Project Board. The purpose is to increase the community's awareness, especially for secondary schools, related to the impact of land degradation, climate change, and watershed management on birds' biodiversity.</p> <p>The target level of the indicator was achieved.</p>



3.4.3. Tree planting in the selected watersheds.	3.4.3. No target level defined.	3.4.3. Seven tree-planting events were conducted, 2 in Pasawaran and 3 in Malang. 3 planting events were also conducted in Jakarta. The level of achievement cannot be assessed because of the lack of a target level.
3.4.4. High school and youth field visit and study tour.	3.4.4. Two field visits and two study tours	3.4.4. Two field visits and two study tours (1 in Pasawaran and 1 in Malang) The target level of the indicator was achieved.
3.4.5. Lessons learned report developed	3.4.5. Lessons learned report developed	3.4.5.. Lessons learned to report in progress, not yet finalized. The target level of the indicator was not achieved. Most probably, it will be achieved by the end of the project.
Output 3.4 was substantially achieved.		
Outcome 3 is considered achieved, and it is fully attributed to the project implementation.		



4.3.b. Relevance

CCCD project was implemented well in the communities. Micro-grants approach was revealed to be very relevant in order to organize the work and promote the engagement with project beneficiaries. It also allowed the disbursement of project funds and made it possible to tailor project activities to the necessity of each working group created in the frame of the project itself.

The work at field level with both local institutional counterparts and beneficiaries was well articulated. Each institution could play a role, relevant to its mandate to support the implementation of activities, and beneficiaries could implement smoothly their activities within each working group. The sequence of activities was logical preparatory assessment and feasibility studies led to the actual implementation on the ground. All stakeholders interviewed at field level appreciated the project approach. The overall process was led by the PMU, who was represented at community level by a field officer.

The overall process of the implementation of field activities built on existing capacities of both beneficiaries and local authority and represented an on-the-job capacity level exercise for all those involved.

The project design was aligned with the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2020. In particular, it was expected to contribute specifically towards the CPD outcome 3 “Sustainable natural resource management and increased resilience”. The contribution to this outcome is undeniable both at national and local level. Moreover, the project was also designed relevantly to the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

As per its design, the CCCD project contributed effectively to the UNDP Strategic Plan Outputs:

1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste; and

2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.

CCCD project was implemented in accordance with its project design only on its local dimension. No major external circumstance occurred during its implementation period. The occurrence of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021 is obviously a very important event that occurred worldwide and in Indonesia. However, the CCCD project did not need to reshape its design to adapt to it, from this perspective the pandemic was not harmful to the project.

The sustainable watershed management was at the core of the project strategy and, as such, it was promoted as a tool for replication in other areas of the country. All stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation exercise considered the work done at district level in the two micro watersheds. Under this perspective, the experience at local level is important also at national level because it provides elements for upscaling measures for environmental conservation and community engagement.

As mentioned in section 4.1.c. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design, the idea to work with a micro watershed approach is a lesson learned originated from a previous UNDP project, “Strengthening Community Based Forest and Watershed Management” funded by the GEF under its replenishment cycle n° 4. No other lessons learned were incorporated into the project. Furthermore, the project did not collaborate with any other initiatives implemented by either UNDP or other development agencies.

The level of stakeholders’ engagement was very high at local level, all concerned parties, i.e., community members (women and men), local authorities, and in a reduced way, the private sector, were involved in the project implementation. The project follows a participatory approach. Instead,



the TE team could not assess the involvement of stakeholders at national level, i.e., under the activities related to outcome 1 led by MoEF.

The TE values the **relevance** of the implementation of the project as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

4.3.c. Effectiveness

Local institutions demonstrated to be committed to project implementation and follow up. CCCD project was implemented with great coordination between all concerned stakeholders in both Malang and Pesawaran districts. In each project area, a watershed forum was endorsed officially by the Regent and a micro watershed management plan was endorsed and partially financed by the districts' authorities. Local authorities demonstrated a high level of commitment towards project implementation.

PMU adopted a logical and well-articulated approach to successfully implement activities at field level. Key aspects of this approach were:

1. Direct and open communication with all stakeholders;
2. Development of tools and study with a serious scientific approach for knowledge generation;
3. Promotion of community participation; and
4. Application of generated knowledge to tailor relevant solutions.

In addition to the achievements related to the specific project indicators, the TE identified as the most significant result, occurred because of the implementation of the CCCD project, the change provoked of mindset of the population living in the project communities in both project areas in Pesawaran and Malang districts. Anecdotal evidence, collected throughout the evaluation exercise, revealed that community members are more aware of existing regulations about the utilization of natural resources of the forest and they know how to use them in a more sustainable way. From a long-term perspective, these communities may further develop their village into a more resilient village.

The evaluation exercise did not identify any specific long term results of the project. Changes in the policy, legislative, and economic instruments at national level represented the groundwork for a better implementation of the three Rio Conventions countrywide. However, these changes did not occur as expected: the CCCD project was mainly implemented at local level by PMU, while at national level, MoEF led the activities, but did not report in the project PIRs. All stakeholders, especially those belonging to PNUD, local communities and local authorities, were much more aware of the activities run at local level.

A person interviewed even stated, *"...in my opinion CCCD project is a livelihoods project implemented in rural communities..."*.

The project's implementation took into consideration gender perspective at field level and had a positive effect on women empowerment in the local communities. All stakeholders interviewed during the TE exercise acknowledged this effect, i.e., that women, who directly benefited from the project felt that their capacity to participate in local development of their communities increased and that they have now, as per the end of project implementation, to make their voice heard. Instead, the evaluation could not assess any significant contribution to policy change at national level in terms of women's economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights.

CCCD project achieved fully 8 and partially 5 outputs out of 13 total outputs. All outputs related to outcome 1 were partially achieved and the direct contribution of the project to that achievement was only partial: as already mentioned, MoEF took the lead and funded related activities, which were not even reported in the PIRs of the CCCD project. Instead, 4 out of 5 outputs of outcome 2 were achieved. Indeed, the implementation of the Micro Watershed Plans in the districts of Pesawaran (Lampung province) and Malang (East Java province) represented in the opinions of all stakeholders interview



the main achievement of the project. As a matter of fact, the implementation of the project in the two areas represents the archive of experiences that may inform the future work of MoEF in implementing the three Rio Conventions. The project achieved all outputs related to outcome 3. However, as mentioned in section 4.1.a. “Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators”, outcome 3 is considered complementary to outcomes 1 and 2, and as such has a lighter relative weight for assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of CCCD project.

The TE values the **effectiveness** of the implementation of the project as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

4.3.d. Efficiency

Project funds were allocated for the achievement of results at local level, i.e., to work with local authorities and with communities at district level in Lampung and East Java. Without the necessity to implement activities at national level, which were led by MoEF, the project could increment the efforts and, consequently, be allocated to outcome 2. This decision is considered as an element of efficiency because it focused on the core result of the project, i.e., the implementation of the Micro Watershed Management Plans, aiming at providing inputs for the scalability of the project in other parts of the country. CCCD project was cost effective.

The project budgeting did not include any specific lines devoted to the promotion of gender equality and human rights and the inclusion of the most marginalized. This kind of approach was not foreseen in the ProDoc. As already mentioned earlier in the report, the SESP annexed to the ProDoc stated, “there are no environmental or social risks (gender and human rights) related to this project”.

However, at field level, the UNDP human rights principles of equality, participation, inclusion, accountability and rule of law were considered throughout all project implementation period.

The CCCD project required an overall extension of ten months as, at its beginning, the project suffered a delay of more than one year following the merge of two existing ministries (Environment and Forestry) into one to become the MoEF, which is the project’s Executing Agency, which affected the operational capacity of the newly established ministry. Indeed, the MTR suggested at least a six-month no-cost extension to recover the initial delay in overall project implementation. Furthermore, towards the end of the implementation period COVID-19 pandemic broke out. It is evident that an extension was ineluctable to complete project activities.

The PMU proved to be effective in managing and monitoring project activities. It an activity-based monitoring approach: the approach is valued as pertinent by the present evaluation exercise, because of the nature of activities implemented within the project. Moreover, the Results Framework did not allow any other kind of monitoring.

CCCD project turned to be a local project, whose national dimension was very much under-implemented: MoEF took the lead of the activities related to the national dimension of outcome 1, which was not funded by the project. The project served as an archive of experience related to the implementation of the Micro Watersheds Plans to inform the work of MoEF. Therefore, the project, specifically the PMU, did not play any role in monitoring these activities.

As mentioned in section 4.2.a “adaptive management”, the decision to implement the CCCD project almost exclusively at local level, while using other funds to implement activities under outcome 1, was not written in any official project related document,

Finally, the delivery of project funds did not encounter any problems and did make possible the smooth implementation of the activities.

The TE values the **efficiency** of the implementation of the project as **Satisfactory**.



4.3.e. Coordination

CCCD project implementation did not entail any collaboration with other UN agencies, development partners, donors, NGOs, and academic institutions. The project envisaged neither any joint planning nor joint programming with other initiatives led by UNDP.

Gender issues were mainstreamed in the Micro Watershed Management Plans, which were the two main management tools created in the frame of the project. The formation of women working groups is the main element that promotes women's empowerment.

The CCCD project collaborated with a private sector enterprise in Malang (PT. Perhutani) in the form of 10 hectares of agroforestry. There was no direct cooperation with NGOs since there is no specific budget/allocation for them. However, NGOs and academic institutions involvement put into account as a part of training for the communities, i.e., SWAT training, assisting the local community in bird watching, and guidance of awareness for climate change.

4.3.f. Sustainability: financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, environmental, overall likelihood of sustainability

Financial sustainability:

The project results, as per their actual level of achievement, do not present financial, institutional, and political significant risks for their sustainability in the long term. Since there is already a policy in place, in the form of the micro watershed management plan in both villages, national and local authorities commit to preparing a budget to sustain long-term project results.

Actually, MoEF is already financing the replication of some elements of the Micro Watershed Management Plans. In particular, it is working with farmers working groups of forest and land rehabilitation through the application of agroforestry practices at community level. Furthermore, community management of forest areas is included under a social forestry scheme is regulated in the Decree of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry SK.744 / MENLHK-PKTL / REN / PLA.0 / 1/2019.

The TE assesses the **financial sustainability** of the project as **likely**.

Socio-political sustainability

Due to the nature of project activities, any socio-political risks at local level to sustaining project results have been identified. Local actors' capacities to manage natural resources in a sustainable way were strengthened, and communities became more resilient. In this regard, the TE exercise acknowledged that although the COVID-19 related restrictions had a harmful impact on the country's general economy, the working groups managed to keep carrying out their work.

Project results are very circumscribed to the local realities in Pesawaran and Malang. In the two areas, sustainability does not present any significant risks to the project's overall sustainability. The buy-in of local authorities and the commitment of the working groups were clearly identified during all interview and by some hard evidence, i.e., the endorsement and utilization of the two Micro Watershed Management Plans and the financial resources committed by local authorities to keep the plans running, at least, until 2023. Furthermore, as mentioned, the working group approach is already being replicated in other areas of the countries.

The work done by MoEF at national level without the project funds highlights that there is a political will to promote the implementation of the three Rio Conventions. However, the evaluation team could not assess the engagement of private sector and civil society towards the project and its objective, especially those at national level (outcome 1). NGOs and private sector are widely recognized as key actors of rural development, therefore the socio-political sustainability could not be assessed by the present evaluation exercise.



The TE was **unable to assess** the **socio-political sustainability** of the project.

Institutional framework and governance sustainability

MoEF took the lead to produce most of the outputs foresaw under outcome 1:

- Assessment of the current policy and legal framework
- Assessment of information and knowledge needs of social actors and other stakeholders that can play a role in catalyzing Rio Convention implementation
- Formulated and approved operational guidelines and any other policy, legislative, or regulatory instrument amended
- Strengthen institutional mechanisms for improved coordination and collaboration
- New or improved consultative and decision-making institutional mechanism

These elements bode well for the institutional framework and governance sustainability.

The TE assesses the **institutional framework and governance sustainability** of the project as **likely**.

Environmental sustainability

The evaluation has identified no major threats for environmental sustainability. Actually, the work done at the field level was recognized by all stakeholders as very pertinent to support the community in becoming more resilient against climate change. All other achievements were designed to improve the overall capacities to deal with environmental issues. As such, they do not face any major treats, too.

The TE assesses the **environmental sustainability** of the project as **likely**.

4.3.g. Country ownership

CCCD project fits well into the national sectoral and development plans. The country's institutional ownership of the project is very high. Actually, the MoEF took the lead, with its own funds, of the implementation of the national dimension of outcome 1 and left the implementation of the activities at the district level to the PMU. For the Project Board, the district-level experience represented the piloting elements that will inform the implementation of similar activities in the future. In fact, the MoEF Directorate of Watershed Management and Evaluation in other country areas already puts some of these elements, i.e., the farmer working group approach, into practice.

It is important to highlight that the project took into consideration almost exclusively only the community approach to natural resource management. Two important development actors, i.e., the private sector and NGOs, were not substantially involved. The overall country ownership going beyond the institutional vision of the MoEF is evidently very low.

4.3.h. Gender equality and women's empowerment

The implementation of the project took into consideration gender perspective at field level: the project included a consistent representation of women in the working groups constituted during its implementation in the project communities' district. However, the evaluation exercise cannot affirm whether or not a consistent change in gender role actually happened. The main element related to gender equality and women's empowerment was the work carried out with the working groups at community level with the capacity building initiatives.

The CCCD project was In line with the entry points of gender mainstreaming of UNDP Corporate Strategy on Gender Equality. Interrelated outcomes of this program were:



- Improvement of the standard of living and increasing income by agricultural products innovation and home artisanal production, i.e., batik fabric into cloth.
- Support the women's participation in sustainable management of natural resources.

4.3.i. Cross-cutting Issues

CCCD project had undoubtedly positive effects for the target population in the two project site in Pasawaran and Malang districts:

- Job creation and income generation
- Reforestation;
- Promotion of climate change adaptation and mitigation measured; and
- Capacity development of local communities and local authorities.

Activities conducted at district level have contributed to paving the way for a better implementation of the Rio Conventions, i.e., UNFCCC, UNCCD, and CBD. Under the district perspective, the CCCD project contributed directly to two CPD Outcomes:

- Outcome 1. Sustainable employment and income generation; and
- Outcome 3. Sustainable natural resource management and increased resilience.

The overall effect of the project at community level was the creation of awareness about the poverty-environment nexus and the understanding of how economic activities may take advantage of well-planned natural resources management plans, represent specifically by the micro watershed management plans.

Finally, the CCCD project promoted, at field level, the UNDP human rights principles of equality, participation, social inclusion, accountability and rule of law, which were taken into consideration throughout all project implementation period.

At local level, the project resulted to be gender targeted.

4.3.j. GEF additionality

In accordance with the "Evaluative Approach to Assessing GEF's Additionality", the evaluation exercise identified the following elements for each of the six areas of GEF's additionality:

Areas of GEF's additionality	Elements identified by the evaluation exercise
Specific Environmental Additionality <i>The GEF provides a wide range of value-added interventions/services to achieve the Global Environmental Benefits.</i>	The project focused on climate change adaptation and mitigation activities in the two project areas with the communities.
Legal/Regulatory Additionality <i>The GEF helps stakeholders transformational change to environment sustainable legal /regulatory forms.</i>	It was the core of the project. However, the Project Board decided to focus exclusively on district level. The project also promoted the micro watershed management approach at community level as a tool to mainstream the three conventions. At national level, the project did not contribute to any relevant activities. The lead was taken by the MoEF who implemented all activities related to the national dimension.
Institutional Additionality/Governance additionality <i>The GEF provides support to the existing institution to transform into efficient/sustainable environment manner.</i>	The project succeeded in promoting a better governance at project site level. At national level, the effect of GEF additionality is very weak.



Financial Additionality	The co-financing from MoE was fully aligned to the initial commitment. As such, the financial additionality can be considered extremely valuable.
Socio-Economic Additionality	The socio-economic effects of the project are those more appreciated in the stakeholders opinions. Some stakeholders even defined the project closer to a livelihood project rather than to an environmental one.
Innovation Additionality	The evaluation did not identify any innovation additionality.

As mentioned in section section “4.1.a. Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators”, outcomes do not present any indicators, and the performance of the project in terms of achievements can be monitored and evaluated only against outputs’ indicators. The indicators at output level capture the groundwork for a more effective support to the implementation of the Rio Conventions at district, which represented the overall GEF additionality of the CCCD project.

4.3.k. Catalytic/Replication Effect

CCCD project as at its core the piloting activities at community level through the design and implementation of Micro Watershed Plans. These plans are the elements that may be used in the next future to replicate and scale up the project approach to other watersheds in the countries.

In fact, the plans are recognized as a practical tool to implement the Rio Conventions at community level, being the restoration and conservation of the natural resource, sustainable land and water management, and the acknowledgement of the nexus between environment, livelihoods and development. In addition, the MoEF is already replicating elements included in the Micro Watershed Plans.

Finally, the evaluation acknowledges that the work done by the MoEF with its funds is as well key to support the replication of the work done in the project sites.

4.3.l. Progress to Impact

The impact of the CCCD project in the field is significant within the communities involved in Pesawaran (Lampung province) and Malang district (East Java). The main impact at field level is the change of attitude and knowledge of local communities towards natural resource conservation and climate change adaptation. Due to the very narrow geographical scope of activity at field level, the impact on environmental status change is obviously not significant in national terms. However, it is important to highlight, that the project, as for its design, was not expected to have that kind of impact.

The main element related to gender equality and women’s empowerment was the work carried out with the working groups at community level with the capacity building initiatives. Women are more aware of their role in local development of their communities and are more able to make their voice heard at community level.

All outputs achieved under outcome 1 “Strengthened policy, legislative, and economic instruments.” represents an impact although only very partially attributable to the project because, as already mentioned activities were conducted autonomously by the MoE. The Micro Watershed Plans at local level, instead, represent that core impact of the project in terms of improved environmental governance at district level.

The evaluation did not identify any unintended impacts.

Finally, the evaluation stresses that the impact on the livelihoods of project beneficiaries both men and women is, instead, very significant. The working group approach with micro-grants promoted by the project was demonstrated to be positive.



5. Main findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned

5.1. Main findings

TE exercise highlights eighteen main findings:

Project Design/Formulation

1. Project design, visualized in the Results Framework, did not constitute neither an effective guidance tool for the implementation nor an useful tool for M&E purposes. Objective's indicators were not SMART, outcomes did not present any indicators. Output's indicators were the only ones available to track the project implementation.
2. The project design was as well very redundant. The formulation of objective, outcome, and output was very similar. Although this occurrence, the overall idea of the project was clear: to lay down the groundwork for an improved implementation of the three Rio Convention, i.e. UNFCCC, UNCCCD, and CBD, at country level.
3. The dimensions of income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, and livelihood benefits of the broader impact of the project are not captured at any level in the project design.
4. The ProDoc did not provide any guidance on how to engage effectively during the project with relevant stakeholders.

Project Implementation

5. The implementation of the project did not envisage any change in its design, decided and formalized during sessions of the Project Board. No major adaptive management decisions were formalized.
6. The implementation focused on the achievement of output indicators. The Project Management Unit (PMU) led the implementation at field level successfully. Instead, MoEF led the process related to strengthening policy, legislative, and economic instruments.
7. MoEF cofinancing was compliant with the initial commitment of the institution to the project.
8. All work led by MoEF was neither monitored in the frame of the project nor reported in any documents.
9. The work done through the micro-grants revealed to be essential for the promotion of cross-cutting issues that were not captured in the project design, i.e., income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, and livelihood benefits of the broader impact of the project.
10. At local level, the project managed to have all relevant stakeholders on board for the successful implementation of activities. No significant barriers were encountered and the engagement with all stakeholders happened without any major problem.
11. The PMU articulated the work in an efficient way. Funds were oriented to relevant activities, the expertise of PMU members and consultants hired was adequate to the needs of the project.

Project Results

12. Sustainable watershed management was at the centre of the project implementation and, as such, it was promoted as a tool for replication in other areas of the country.



13. The strengthening policy, legislative, and economic instruments happened outside the project frame: activities were funded with other funds and not reported to UNDP. GEF funding was not relevant for the implementation of these activities.
14. The project was effective in achieving its outputs.
15. The intervention resulted to be sustainable and replicable. This is due prevalently to the work done at district level in collaboration with local stakeholders, i.e., public authorities, communities, CBOs, and a private company.
16. Sustainability at national level is not fully assessable. Due to the lack of reporting on outcome 1, the TE Team could not coordinate with the PMU interviews with stakeholders who participate in the process since PMU refer to the process of PIR.
17. Although gender issues were not captured in the project design, CCCD project promoted gender equality by contributing to the improvement of the standard of living and increasing income by agricultural products innovation and artisanal home production, and by supporting the women's participation in sustainable management of natural resources.
18. Job creation and income generation, reforestation, promotion of climate change adaptation and mitigation measured, and capacity development of local communities and local authorities were key issues addressed at district level.

5.2. Conclusions

7 are the main conclusions of the TE exercise:

1. Project design, as per the ProDoc and related Results Framework, did not include enough information for the PB and PMU to implement the project in coherence with its design. Indicators at output level were the only elements clearly defined. The evaluation acknowledges that the choice was legitimate: the Results Framework included so many flaws that it should have been completely revised. Indeed, the MTR, as well, did not report any recommendation on the issue.
2. The actual achievement at a level higher than outputs is not measurable. The evaluation assessed the achievement at the outcome and objective level as moderately satisfactorily taking into consideration the achievement at output level achievement and the opinions of stakeholders interviewed.
3. It is self-evident that communication between PMU, Project Board, and UNDP did not work properly. The lack of official documentation reporting about outcome 1 represents a concern in terms of project accountability.
4. The main achievement of the project, i.e., the successful implementation of activities in two micro watersheds, is very significant. MoEF can use the experiences to replicate the approach and scale activities in other areas of the country.
5. The plans are actually recognized as a practical tool to implement the Rio Conventions at community level, being the restoration and conservation of natural resources, sustainable land and water management and the acknowledgement of the nexus between environment, livelihoods and development. Moreover, MoEF is already replicating some of its elements.
6. The micro watershed approach is centred on rural communities and local authorities. The replication of it is somehow restricted in areas where the two groups of stakeholders are predominant. Engagement with private sector, big economic players, was not envisaged by the project.



7. Cross cutting relevant to sustainable development was promoted by the project, i.e., gender equality, human rights, capacity development, and climate change adaptation.

5.3. Recommendations

Recommendations to improve the course of action of the project by the end of its implementation are not needed, there would be not much time to implement them.

The TE exercise provides the following three recommendations to be applied in other initiatives:

1. Project design should avoid redundancies within and amongst different hierarchical levels of the Result Framework, i.e., objective, outcomes, and outputs. A redundant Result Framework does not allow an effective project management and impedes the identification of relevant changes promoted/induced by projects. Indicators of objectives, outcomes, and outputs should capture different changes produced by the project under consideration. Outputs refer to changes under almost the full control of the project management. i.e., what the project actually does, while outcomes and objectives capture changes to which the project contributes to. It is then important, that the team in charge of writing project documents include both thematic specialists and M&E specialists. The two kinds of expertise are important to get to a project design that later can guide the implementation towards its goals.

Responsible entities: UNDP and MoEF

2. During the project design phase or during the inception phase of a project, it is important to get to a common agreement on what are the roles of each project partner. Agreements and decisions should be put in writing, archived, and reported to donors. In this way, a higher level of transparency and accountability is ensured.

Responsible entities: UNDP and MoEF

3. Whenever it is possible, test the micro watershed approach with relevant modifications, to contexts where the private sector has a predominant role, both as an actor of economic development and as a land degradation driver. Indeed, matching economic and social development with the conservation of the environment is the main aspiration of the Rio Conventions (UNFCCC, UNCCD, and CBD). A new collaboration between the two institutions may be the right occasion to do that.

Responsible entities: UNDP and MoEF

5.4. Lessons learned

The present evaluation identified a lesson learned:

1. Building on the needs of communities, and promoting cross cutting issues revealed once again to be key for successful implementation of initiatives with rural communities. Direct and open communication with all stakeholders, development of tools and study with a serious scientific approach for knowledge generation; promotion of community participation; and application of generated knowledge to tailor relevant solutions are as well the main elements to promote rural development.

The lesson learned is related to the typical approach the UNDP promotes worldwide when it comes to work in close collaboration and for the benefit of rural communities. CCCD project, therefore, confirmed the empiric validity of that approach.



6. Annexes



Annex 1 - TE ToR (excluding ToR annexes)

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

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

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

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

BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

Location: Home Based and Jakarta
 Application Deadline: 22 January 2021
 Category: International Consultant/Senior Specialist
 Type of Contract: IC
 Assignment Type: TE International Consultant
 Languages Required: English
 Starting Date: As soon as possible
 Duration of Initial Contract: 25 working days
 Expected Duration of Assignment: February – April 2021 (25 working days)

BACKGROUND

1. INTRODUCTION

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

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

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



and management of home industry in producing variety of non-timber forest products, producing merchandise (such as printed shirts, hats, pins), and in adapting with the covid-19 pandemic by promoting health protocol for the local community (such as making cloth mask, maintaining facilities to wash hand properly with water and soap, producing health supplements made of local herbs etc.).

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

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

3. TE PURPOSE

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

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

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



distancing, and some activities that were supposed to be attended by participants from various places were adjusted through virtual options.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

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

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

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

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

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



ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards

iii. Project Results

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

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

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



- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to include results related to gender equality and empowerment of women.

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

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

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

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

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

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

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



7. TE ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

8. DURATION OF THE WORK

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

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

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

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

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



9. DUTY STATION

Travel:

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

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

10. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

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

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

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

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

International Consultant

Education

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

Experience

- Relevant experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies; Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)



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

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

11. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. **This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'.** The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

12. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

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

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

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



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

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

APPLICATION PROCESS²

13. Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

Financial Proposal:

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

14. Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template³](#) provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form⁴](#)); Including experiences that mentioned in the Required Skills and Experiences
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment, including approach of issues related to gender and Multi focal area of Cross-Cutting Capacity Development in 3 Rio Conventions, sustainable development and/or biodiversity; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Capacity Development for Implementing Rio Conventions through Enhancing Incentive Mechanisms for Sustainable Watershed/Land Management" or by email at the following address ONLY: bids.id@undp.org by 23:59 PM GMT +7 on 22 January 2021. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

15. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

² Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>
³ <https://intranet.undp.org/unlv/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20or%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

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



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

16. TOR ANNEXES

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



Annex 2 - TE virtual mission agenda

The TE team had the following virtual meetings:

Wednesday, March 10th

15:00 – 16:00 – Meeting of TE Team with Mr. Iwan Kurniawan

16:00 – 16:30 - Meeting of TE Team with Dr. Agus Prabowo

19:00 – 20:30 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mr. Brian Kanardi

Thursday, March 11th

14:00 – 15:00 – Meeting of TE Team with Mr. Mohammed Yayat Afianto

15:00 – 16:30 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mr. Brian Kanardi

Friday, March 12th

20:00 – 21:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mrs. Ratna Kusuma Sari and Mr. Brian Kanardi

Monday, March 15th

19:00 – 20:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mr. Idi Bantara

Wednesday, March 17th

17:00 – 18:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Dr. Fifin Nopiansyah

21:00 – 22:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Dr. Saparis Soedarjanto

Friday, March 19th

19:15 – 20:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mr. Anak Agung Gede Putra and Mrs. Astutie Widyarissantie

Monday, March 22nd

15:00 – 16:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mrs. Ersu Herwindo

16:00 – 17:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mr. Kunto Hirsilo

Wednesday, March 24th

21:30 – 22:15 - Meeting of the TE Team with Mrs. Ratna Kusuma Sari and Mr. Brian Kanardi

Thursday, March 25th

15:00 – 16:00 - Meeting of the TE Team with Mrs. Laksmie Dhewanti

Monday, March 29th

21:00 – 22:00 – Meeting of the TE Team with Mrs. Ratna Kusuma Sari and Mr. Brian Kanardi

Wednesday, March 31th

19:00 – 19:30 – Meeting of the TE Team with Dr. Fifin Nopiansyah and Mrs. Astutie Widyarissantie

Friday, April 2nd

19:00 – 19:30 – Meeting of the TE Team with Dr. Saparis Soedarjanto

The international Consultant had the following virtual meetings:

Friday, March 26th

14:00 – 15:30 – Meeting of the International Consultant with Mrs. Yenny Widjaja

15:00 – 16:00 – Meeting of the International Consultant with Mrs. Nadezda Liscakova

Monday, March 29th

16:15 – 16:45 – Meeting of the International Consultant with Mr. Mohammed Yayat Afianto

Wednesday, March 31th

20:00 – 20:30 – Meeting of the International Consultant with Mr. Iwan Kurniawan



The National Consultant had the following virtual meetings:

Monday, March 15th

14.00 – 15.00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mrs. Gita Puspita Abriani.

15.00 – 16.00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mrs. Anis Sulistyowati, Mrs. Lani Masruro, Mrs. Yulia Kresnawati, Mr. Mukti Zakaria, and Mr. Kusman.

16.00 – 17.15 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mr. Titis Agung Wahyudi, Mr. Aptu Andy Kurniawan, Mr. Rahadi Ariyanto, Mrs. Susi Hayuningtyas, Mr. Anang Setyanugraha, Mr. Sugeng Widodo, Mrs. Ayus Faizah.

Tuesday, March 16th

15.00 – 16.00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mr. Yudiana, Mrs. Yanti Meda, Mrs. Eka Juniati.

19.00 – 20.15 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mr. Purwoto, Mr. Sugiarto, Mr. Gatot Kasiono.

Thursday, March 18th

14:00 – 15:00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mr. Fisky Virdous.

Friday, March 19th

14:00 – 16:00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mr. Sutisna, Mr. Novizul, Mr. Syafe'i, Mrs. Lastri, Mr. Sarkoni, Mr. Iskandar.

Monday, March 22nd

15:00 – 16:00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Mr. Tatag Hari Rudhata

Tuesday, March 23th

15:00 – 16:00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Representatives of working groups in Bringin and Bambang villages: Mr. Warianto, Mr. Yasmiadi, Mrs. Septi Hartatik, Mrs. Marliyah, Mrs. Tri Astuti Arini, Mrs. Indah Purwati

19:00 – 20:00 – Meeting of the National Evaluator with Representatives of working groups in Bringin and Bambang villages: Mr. Wiji Wulansari, Mr. Agus M. Fadil, Mrs. Risa Trimilasari, Mr. Erinanto, Mr. Wijiono, Mr. Purnomo, Mr. Gallant Primananda, Mr. Ridu, Mr. Mugi



Annex 3 - List of persons interviewed

Stakeholders based in Jakarta

1. Mr. Iwan Kurniawan

UNDP Programme Manager, Natural Resources Management/Environment Unit

2. Dr. Agus Prabowo

UNDP Head of the Environment Unit

3. Mr. Brian Kanardi

PMU Project Consultant

4. Mr. Mohammed Yayat Afianto

UNDP M&E Officer of the Environment Unit

5. Mrs. Ratna Kusuma Sari

National Project Manager (NPM)

6. Mr. Idi Bantara

Head of the Management Office of Watershed and Protected Forest Way Sekampung Seputih (BPDASHL WSS)

7. Dr. Fifin Nopiansyah

Head of Section Wildlife, Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation at MoEF
CBD Focal Point

8. Dr. M. Saparis Soedarjanto

Director, Directorate of Watershed Management and Evaluation at MoEF
National Project Director
UNCCD Focal Point

9. Mr. Anak Agung Gede Putra

Head of Sub-Directorate of Adaptation Planning, Directorate of Directorate of Adaptation on Climate Change at MoEF
UNFCCC Focal Point

10. Mrs. Astutie Widyarissantie

Head of Ecological Adaptation Planning Section, Directorate of Directorate of Adaptation on Climate Change at MoEF

11. Mrs. Ersu Herwinda

Deputy Director, Environmental Affairs, BAPPENAS

12. Mrs. Laksmie Dhewanti

MoEF Gef Operational Focal Point

13. Mrs. Yenny Widjaja

UNDP Gender Focal Point

14. Mrs Nadezka Liscakova

UNDP Project Associate

Stakeholders based in Lampung Province

1. Mr. Idi Bantara

Head of Management Office of Watershed and Protected Forest Way Sekampung Seputih (BPDASHL WSS)

2. Mr. Fisky Virdous

Head of Bureau of Regional Planning and Development in Pesawaran District

3. Mrs. Gita Puspita Abriani

Field Assistant, Conservation Office of Natural Resource Bengkulu and Lampung

**4. Mr. Yudiana**

Head of the Destination and Tourism Industry, Office of Tourism, Pesawaran District

5. Mrs. Yanti Meda

Head of the section for pollution control and environmental damage, Office of Environment, Pesawaran District

6. Mrs. Eka Juniati

Head of the Animal Health Section, Office of Agriculture, Pesawaran District

7. Mr. Iskandar

Head of the section for forest protection and natural resource conservation, Forest Management Unit in Pesawaran

8. Mr. Sutisna

Representatives of cluster agrosilvopastore in Bayas Jaya Village: Forest Farmers Group “Indah Jaya”

9. Mr. Novizul

Representatives of natural tourism management cluster in Bayas Jaya Village: tourism conscious group “Andan Jaya”

10. Mr. Syafe'i

Representatives of environmental management cluster in Bayas Jaya Village: environmentally conscious group “Kusuma Sari”

11. Mrs. Lastri

Representatives of home industry cluster in Bayas Jaya Village: forest farmer women's group “Mawar Merah”

12. Mr. Sarkoni

Treasurer in Bayas Jaya Village

Stakeholders based in East Java Province

1. Mrs. Yulia Kresnawati

Head of Sub-Division of Infrastructure related to natural resources and environment, Bappeda (Regional Development Planning Agency)

2. Mrs. Anis Sulistyowati

Head of Sub-Division of Environmental Maintenance, Environment Office

3. Mrs. Lani Masruro

Secretary of Tourism Office

4. Mr. Mukti Zakaria

Head of Sub-Division of Water Resources Utilization Control at the Forestry Service Branch, Watershed Management Office

5. Mr. Kusman

Monitoring and evaluation section staff, Watershed Management Office

6. Mr. Titis Agung Wahyudi

Head of the Forest Management Resort in South Bambang, National Forest Company (Perhutani)

7. Mr. Aptu Andy Kurniawan

Head of Water Resource Development Section, Office of Public Service for Water Resource in Malang District

8. Mr. Rahadi Ariyanto

Head of Fishermen Partnership and Science and Technology Application, Office of Fishery in Malang

9. Mrs. Susi Hayuningtyas

Head of the Cultivation Area section, Office of Fishery in Malang



10. Mr. Anang Setyanugraha

Head of the Empowerment of Small Fishermen, Office of Fishery in Malang

11. Mr. Sugeng Widodo

Head of the animal feed section, Office of Animal Husbandry in Malang

12. Mrs. Ayus Faizah

Head of Cooperative Empowerment, Office of Cooperative and Small-middle Business in Malang

13. Mr. Purwoto

Chief of Wajak sub-district

14. Mr. Sugiarto

Chiefs of Bambang village

15. Mr. Gatot Kasiono

Secretary of Bringin Village

16. Mr. Tatag Hari Rudhata

Head of Section II National Park Management (PTN) Bromo Tengger Semeru National Park

17. Mr. Kunto Hirsilo

Head of Watershed and Protected Forest Management Center (BPDASHL) - Brantas-Sampean

18. Mr. Warianto

Forest Village Community Institution "Wana Tani Sido Makmur"

19. Mr. Yasmiadi

Forest Village Community Institution "Wana Tani Sido Makmur"

20. Mrs. Septi Hartatik

Farmer's Women Group "Sri Rejeki"

21. Mrs. Marliyah

Farmer's Women Group "Sri Rejeki"

22. Mrs. Tri Astuti Arini

Bringin Batik Group

23. Mrs. Indah Purwati

Bringin Batik Group

24. Mr. Wiji Wulansari

Youth organization "Bina Remaja"

25. Mr. Agus M. Fadil

Tourism Awareness Group "Alam Asri"

26. Mrs. Risa Trimilasari

Tourism Awareness Group "Alam Asri"

27. Mr. Erinanto

Farmers Group "Asih Wono"

28. Mr. Wijiono

Farmers Group "Asih Wono"

29. Mr. Purnomo

Tourism Awareness Group "Bringin Indah"

30. Mr. Gallant Primananda

Tourism Awareness Group "Bringin Indah"

31. Mr. Ridu

Youth organization "Bina Remaja"

32. Mr. Mugi

Youth organization "Bina Remaja"



Annex 4 - List of documents reviewed

Documents:

- ⇒ A Human Rights-based Approach to Development Programming in UNDP – Adding the Missing Link
- ⇒ Action Plan Strategy of the CCCD Project (2019-2020) and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (2020-2024)
- ⇒ Approval and direction for the conservation partnership of the "Alam Asri" tourism awareness group in Bromo Tengger Semeru National Park
- ⇒ Birds in the Sumberbulu micro watershed, Malang Regency
- ⇒ Compilation of the Biophysical / Characteristics of Watershed in Malang and Pesawaran
- ⇒ Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry regarding the recognition and protection of forestry partnerships between the forest farmer group (Cirompang Lestari, Cirompang Jaya, Indah Jaya) and the Regional Technical Implementation Unit of the Pesawaran Forest Management Unit in Bayas Jaya Village
- ⇒ Decree of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry SK.495 and SK.744 of 2019
- ⇒ Decree of the Regent related to the watersheds forum (2019-2024) in Malang and Pesawaran
- ⇒ Decree of the Watersheds and Protection Forest Management Agency regarding the micro watershed model's location associated with the CCCD project in Malang and Pesawaran
- ⇒ Example of farmer working group's profile: 1) "Bringin Indah" tourism awareness group, Malang; 2) "Berkah Jaya" Forest Farming Women Group (KWTH), Pesawaran
- ⇒ Example of feasibility studies report in Malang and Pesawaran: 1) climate change adaptation and 2) ecosystem biodiversity
- ⇒ Examples of SCU East Java and SCU Lampung publications: 1) In the Media Indonesia newspaper; 2) CCCD leaflet; 3) Video of SCU East Java and Lampung
- ⇒ Focus Group Discussion (FGD) reports on Global Targets and Commitments to Conventions and International Cooperation
- ⇒ Guidelines for implementing the CCCD project communication strategy
- ⇒ Identification of the institution of watersheds in Malang and Pesawaran
- ⇒ Indonesia's Sixth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Natrep VI)
- ⇒ Landscape Governance Study Reports in Malang and Pesawaran
- ⇒ Malang Micro-grant Market Analysis
- ⇒ Methods and Measurement Tools for the Estimation of the Awareness (Awareness Assessment) of the Output 3 CCCD Project Activities
- ⇒ Micro Watershed Management Plans
 - Sumberbulu micro watershed management plan spatially based (2019-2023) and Decree of the Sumberbulu micro watershed management coordination forum
 - Way Khilau micro watershed management plan (2019-2023) and Decree of the Way Khilau micro watershed management coordination forum
- ⇒ Mid Term Review report



- ⇒ Module Three Rio Conventions with local contents of Lampung for Junior High School (SMP)/equivalent level
- ⇒ Monitoring and Evaluation of the CCCD project
- ⇒ Monitoring and Evaluation of Watershed / Sub-watershed Management at CCCD project sites in 2019-2020
- ⇒ National Mid Term Development Planning (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional)
- ⇒ News writing manual on the CCCD website
- ⇒ ProDoc and annexes
- ⇒ Project Board Meeting report II, III, IV, and V
- ⇒ Project extension document
- ⇒ Project Implementation Reviews
 - 2018
 - 2019
 - 2020
- ⇒ Provision of CCCD Project Micro-Grants
- ⇒ Recapitulation of planning for group training needs for 2019-2020 and its examples: 1) SWAT hydrological model training; 2) Agroforestry training; and 3) Training in developing tourism villages
- ⇒ Regulation of the Director-General of Watershed and Protected Forest Control P.4/PDASHL/SET/KUM.1/7/2018
- ⇒ Regulation of the MoEF: P.7 and P.105 of 2018, P2 of 2020.
- ⇒ Socio-Economic and Gender Mainstreaming Study in Malang and Pesawaran (2018 and 2020)
- ⇒ Standard Operating Procedure of the CCCD Project
- ⇒ UNDP Country Programme Document
- ⇒ UNDP-GEF MTR Management Response
- ⇒ UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (Policy Update, OPG approved in 2019)
- ⇒ Questionnaire Results for Government and Community Understanding of Rio Convention Issues (Land Degradation, Biodiversity, and Climate Change)

Websites:

- ⇒ www.thegef.org
- ⇒ www.id.undp.org
- ⇒ <https://cccd.id>



Annex 5 - Evaluation Question Matrix

Key evaluation questions	Indicators	Sources of data	Methodology
Criterion: Relevance			
1. Is CCCD project's theory of change clearly articulated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Level of coherence between project's theory of change and the intended outcomes and objective. - Relationships established within project levels (long term goal, objective, outcomes and outputs) 	ProDoc (Project Result Framework); and Project staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
2. What specific methods and tools were used to assess the needs of the project beneficiaries? Have the interventions match the capacities needs for the institutions and individuals?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of methods and tools used to assess the needs of the project beneficiaries - Extent to which CCCD Project matched the the capacities needs for the institutions and individuals 	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
3. How well does CCCD project react to changing work environment and how well has the design able to adjust to changing external circumstances?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of work environment changes - Identification of adjustment measures to identified changes 	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
4. How did UNDP/ CCCD project contribute towards, and advance gender equality aspirations of the Government of Indonesia; UNDAF outcomes; and CPD outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modalities and extent to which the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment 	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
Criterion: Effectiveness			
1. To what extent is CCCD project successful in achieving the expected results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent to which the CCC Project achieved indicators at output and outcome level 	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation



2. To what extent were target institutions (MoEF primarily) engaged in the implementation of the project?	- Extent to which target institution engaged in the implementation of the project	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
3. How effective CCCD project has been in developing institutional capacity especially in preparing policy review and monitoring MoEF in gender responsive budgeting?	- Identified gender responsive budgeting within MoEF - Extent to which MoEF capacity has been developed for preparing policy review and monitoring MoEF in gender responsive budgeting?	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
4. To what extent are CCCD project interventions been implemented/ coordinated with appropriate and effective partnership and strategies? What has been the nature and added value of these partnerships?	- Identified roles of project partners - Extent to which this partnership were appreciated by project stakeholders	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
5. What results are evident short-term to long-term results that can be directly or indirectly attributed to the project?	- Identified short-term to long-term results	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation - Contribution analysis
6. What factors contribute or influence CCCD project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women's economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights?	- Identified factors that contributed or influenced CCCD project's ability to positively contribute to policy change from a gender perspective, women's economic empowerment, and access to justice and human rights	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
Criterion: Efficiency			
1. To what extent are funding, staff, and other resources used to achieving the expected results of the project?	- Extent to which funding, staff, and other resources were used to	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff;	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews



	achieving the expected results of the project?	Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Data analysis and triangulation
2. Based on cost-benefit analysis what conclusions can be drawn regarding “value for money” and cost related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing CCCD project?	- Identified efficiencies or inefficiencies	ProDoc, PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews - Data analysis and triangulation
3. Were there any unanticipated events, opportunities or constraints contributed to or hindered the delivery of the interventions on timely manner?	- Extent to which unanticipated events, opportunities or constraints that contributed to or hindered the delivery of the interventions were identified on timely manner	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
4. Have associated risks at the national and local level been anticipated and addressed?	- Extent to which risks at the national and local level been anticipated and addressed	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
Criterion: Coordination			
1. To what extent has the project adopted a coordinated and participatory approach in mainstreaming gender into policies and programs?	- Extent to which CCCD project adopted a coordinated and participatory approach in mainstreaming gender into policies and programs	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
2. To what extent the project used UNDP’s internal expertise and adopted joint planning and programming with other UNDP projects?	- Extent to which CCCD project used UNDP’s internal expertise and adopted joint planning and programming with other UNDP projects	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
3. To what extent was the project effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution?	- Extent to which CCCD project effective in coordinating its activities with UN agencies, relevant development partners, donors, CSO, NGOs and academic institution	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews



Criterion: Sustainability			
1. To what extent are there financial, institutional risks to sustaining long-term project results?	- Extent to which identified financial and institutional risks may harm the long-term sustainability of results	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
2. To what extent are there socio-political risks to sustaining long-term project results?	- Extent to which identified socio-political risks may harm the long-term sustainability of results	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
3. To what extent are there environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?	- Extent to which identified environmental risks may harm the long-term sustainability of results	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
Criterion: Gender equality and women's empowerment			
1. How and to what extent did the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment?	- Modalities and extent to which the project contribute to gender equality and women's empowerment	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews
Criterion: Progress to impact			
1. Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?	Identified indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status	PIRs; Technical reports; Budget disbursements; Project staff; Project stakeholders; and Project Beneficiaries	- Desk review - Virtual individual interviews - Virtual group interviews



Annex 6 - TE Rating scale

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

The ratings will be derived from the findings described in the relevant section of the final TE report. , Instead, The Overall Project Outcome rating will be calculated. Such calculation will be based on the ratings for relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, of which relevance and effectiveness are critical.

The rating on relevance will determine whether the overall outcome rating will be in the unsatisfactory range (MU to HU = unsatisfactory range). If the relevance rating is in the unsatisfactory range then the overall outcome will be in the unsatisfactory range as well. However, where the relevance rating is in the satisfactory range (HS to MS), the overall outcome rating could, depending on its effectiveness and efficiency rating, be either in the satisfactory range or in the unsatisfactory range. The overall outcome achievement rating cannot be higher than the effectiveness rating. The overall outcome rating cannot be higher than the average score of effectiveness and efficiency criteria.

In cases where a project's result framework has been modified and approved, and if the modifications in the project impact, outcomes and outputs have not scaled down their overall scope, the TE team should assess outcome achievements based on the revised results framework. In instances where the scope of the project objectives and outcomes has been scaled down, the magnitude of and necessity for downscaling is taken into account and despite achievement of results as per the revised results framework, where appropriate, a lower outcome effectiveness rating may be given.



Annex 7 - UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators

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

Evaluators/Consultants:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of the International Evaluator: Giacomo Morelli

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. I was hired by UNDP although I also conducted the mid term review of the same project as highlighted in my application (specifically in the CV and in the technical proposal)

Signed at Bern, Switzerland on 01/03/2021

Signature:

Name of the National Evaluator: Bachtiar W. Mutaqin

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

Signed at Yogyakarta, Indonesia on 01/03/2021

Signature:




Annex 8: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office


Name: Mr. Teuku Rahmatsyah

Signature: 

Date: 15-Jul-2021

UNDP NCE RTA

Name: Mr. Adnad Kareem

Signature: 

Date: 19-Jul-2021