

UN-REDD
PROGRAMME



UN-REDD Indonesia National Programme Final Evaluation Terms of Reference

UN-REDD Programme

February 2013

1. Background and Context

The UN-REDD Programme is the United Nations collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD) in developing countries. The Programme was launched in 2008 and built on the convening role and technical expertise of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), referred to as the participating UN Organization. The UN-REDD Programme supports nationally-led REDD+ processes and promotes the informed and meaningful involvement of all stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples and other forest-dependent communities, in national and international REDD+ implementation.

The UN-REDD Programme supports national REDD+ readiness efforts in two ways: (i) direct support to the design and implementation of UN-REDD National Programmes; and (ii) complementary support to national REDD+ action through common approaches, analyses, methodologies, tools, data and best practices developed through the UN-REDD Global Programme.

1.1 Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme

Table 1: Programme information

Programme title:	Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme		
Programme Objective:	To support the Government of Indonesia (GoI) to timely develop a REDD architecture that will allow a fair, equitable and transparent REDD implementation, and a sustainable contribution of forestry to a reduction of forestry related greenhouse gas emissions.		
Approval date:	10 March 2009	Fund transfer date:	20 January 2010
Completion date¹:	May 2011	Non cost extension date:	31 October 2012

Indonesia is a country with forest land about 60 % of the country area, the third largest forest area under tropical rainforest in the world. Indonesia's forest is important not only for national economy development and livelihood of local people but also for global environment. Indonesia is the home of mega diversity and one of the custodians of the world tropical peat land.

Indonesia puts a high interest on the issue of climate change including REDD since Indonesia is an island country. The combination of high population density and high levels of biodiversity, together with a staggering 80,000 kilometres of coastline and 17,500 islands, makes Indonesia one of the most vulnerable countries to the impacts of climate change. The devastating impact of global warming is already evident in Indonesia and the effects will be felt more acutely by the poorest people, who are living in the most marginal areas or surrounding forest that are vulnerable to drought, for example, or to floods and landslide.

Indonesia is currently facing the challenge of deforestation and forest degradation and between 2003 and 2006, deforestation and forest degradation was around 1.17 million ha per year. In March 2009, US\$5.6 million was approved by the UN-REDD Programme Policy Board for Indonesia's UN-REDD National Programme, and with the final approval of the National Programme document in January 2010, the country entered its inception and implementation phase. Indonesia was one of the first nine countries identified for country programming under the UN-REDD Programme.

¹ According to National Programme Document

The Programme aimed to support Indonesia developing a REDD architecture that will allow a fair, equitable and transparent REDD implementation, and a sustainable contribution of forestry to a reduction of forestry related greenhouse gas emissions through enhanced multi-stakeholder participation in REDD.

1.1.1 Objective, Expected Outcomes and Outputs

The Objective of the UN-REDD Indonesia Programme is “to support the GoI in attaining REDD-Readiness”. In order to secure this Objective, three Outcomes with subsequent outputs and activities were planned:

- Outcome 1: Strengthened multi-stakeholder participation and consensus at national level
 - Output 1.1 (UNDP): Consensus on key issues for national REDD policy development
 - Output 1.2 (UNDP): REDD lessons learned
 - Output 1.3 (UNEP): Communications Programme
- Outcome 2 Successful demonstration of establishing a REL, MRV and fair payment systems based on the national REDD architecture
 - Output 2.1 (FAO): Improved capacity and methodology design for forest carbon inventory within a Measurement, Reporting and Verification System (MRV), including sub-national pilot implementation
 - Output 2.2 (FAO): Reference Emissions Level (REL)
 - Output 2.3 (UNDP): Harmonized fair and equitable payment mechanism at provincial level
 - Output 2.4 (UNEP): Toolkit for priority setting towards maximizing potential Carbon-benefits and incorporating co-benefits, such as biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation under MDG
- Outcome 3: Capacity established to implement REDD at decentralized levels
 - Output 3.1 (UNDP): Capacity for spatial socio-economic planning incorporating REDD at the district level
 - Output 3.2 (UNDP): Empowered local stakeholders are able to benefit from REDD
 - Output 3.3 (UNDP): Multi-stakeholder-endorsed District plans for REDD implementation

1.1.2 Executing Arrangements

The Lead Implementing Partner of this Programme was the Ministry of Forestry. A national implementation management approach of the UN was used to run the programme. A National Project Director (NPD) was appointed by the GoI. The NPD directed the programme and carry overall accountability on behalf of the GoI for the programme to the Project Executive Board (PEB; see below). The overall programme and each specific activity were implemented under the leadership of the GoI, represented by the NPD. The programme was managed in accordance with the 2003 UNDG Guidance Note on Joint Programming and executed by several “National Implementing Partners”, including the Ministry of Forestry, Provincial and District agencies, through the participating UN Agencies, i.e. UNEP, FAO, and UNDP. Each of those Implementing Partners was accountable to the Lead Implementing Partner relating to the funds released for the delivery of a specific set of outputs and for management of inputs.

The programme was run and managed following the UN guidance on programme structure with three main components in the programme structure, namely Programme Executive Board (PEB), Project Management Unit (PMU), and Programme Assurance.

Further information on Indonesia’s UN-REDD National Programme executing arrangements and institutional set-up is available in the National Programme Document².

1.1.3 Cost and Financing

The total amount transferred to Indonesia’s UN-REDD National Programme is US\$5,644,250 as shown in Table 2. According to the programme’s latest annual report, in addition to the UN-REDD Programme funding, additional co-financing (cash) for UN-REDD supported activities was provided by UNDP(US\$240,000).

Table 2: Programme Financing (US\$)

Participating UN Organization	Amount allocated	Amount Transferred from the UN-REDD Multi-Partner Trust Fund
FAO	1,498,000	1,498,000
UNDP	2,996,000	2,996,000
UNEP	1,150,250	1,150,250
Total:	5,644,250	5,644,250

1.1.4 Programme Implementation Status

According to the last annual progress report in general, the UN-REDD Programme in Indonesia has performed its mandate in accordance with the work plan and REDD+ national priorities, and has achieved its overall targets. The Programme, for instance, strengthened the development and establishment of several decrees at the national level and provincial, including presidential, ministerial and governor decrees related to REDD+.

The progress made in Central Sulawesi triggered interests from other provinces to conduct field studies in this pilot province (Central Sulawesi). In May 2012, Central Sulawesi was approved to be one of pilot Provinces of the LoI Indonesia-Norway.

The Programme’s multi-stakeholder consensus-based approach has been well implemented and recognized by REDD+ stakeholders in Indonesia, including national and sub-national governments, CSOs, NGOs, the private sector, universities and individual experts. Moreover, under the outcome 1, the Programme has achieved more than the expected and targeted outputs. The communication programme has finalized REDD+ Communication Strategy to promote the importance of REDD+ through various means of communication (television, radio, newspapers, etc.).

There was reported progress in development of methodologies. A methodology for Reference Emission Level (REL) was developed, discussed and tested. As recommended the Ministry of Forestry and BAPPENAS, the methodology for REL was then disseminated and shared through trainings for

² Indonesia National Programme Document is available on: http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3276&Itemid=53

relevant government staff at national level as well as in all 33 provinces in Indonesia. A specialized National Forest Inventory (NFI) database was developed for Indonesia and it has been utilized for data entry. Provincial MoFor offices (BPKH) manifested great interest in using the software and being trained.

Some internal and external challenges were identified in relation to coordination and management. The challenges due to dynamic REDD+ negotiations at international level and debates related with REDD+ issues in Indonesia as well as the disparity of the understanding level on REDD+ issues across the ministry and other stakeholders. In addition, implementing the Programme in a way that the process ensures its sustainability has been more difficult than simply achieving the targets without considering the sustainability of the Programme.

UN-REDD is implemented actions to (a) ensure the involvement of various key stakeholders at national and sub-national levels in developing various policy recommendations related to REDD+ in the country; (b) implement a process-based approach rather than target/output-based (process versus output); (c) collaborate with key institutions that are responsible for actions related to REDD+ implementation such as BAPPENAS, UKP4/REDD+ Task Force, DNPI, DKN, FCPF, Task Force and Climate Change working group of the Ministry of Forestry; and (d) integrate the UN-REDD results into broader programmes/ frameworks acknowledged by the Government of Indonesia (UKP4/REDD+ Working Groups).

Further information on the implementation of the Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme can be found in the Annual and Semi-Annual Programme Reports³.

2. Evaluation Objective and Scope

The scope of the evaluation is the Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme from the time of inception, in January 2010, to closure, in October 2012.

The evaluation of the UN-REDD National Programme is undertaken to assess the programme performance in terms of relevance, effectiveness (outputs and outcomes) and efficiency, and to the extent possible determine impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the programme, including their sustainability. The evaluation has two primary objectives: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among the participating UN Organizations and other partners. Therefore, the evaluation will identify lessons of operational and technical relevance for future programme formulation and implementation in the country, especially future UN-REDD Programmes, and/or for the UN-REDD Programme as a whole.

The primary audience for the evaluation will be the Government of Indonesia, the three participating UN Organizations of the UN-REDD Programme, and the programme resource partners. The secondary audience for the evaluation will be the UN-REDD Policy Board and national stakeholders. The evaluation will also be made available to the public through the UN-REDD Programme website (www.un-redd.org).

³ All Indonesia National Programme reports are available on the MPTF Gateway: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/project/00073509>

2.1 Evaluation Criteria

To focus the evaluation objectives, by defining the standards against which the initiative will be assessed, the following five evaluation criteria will be applied:

- i) **Relevance**, concerning the extent of which the National Programme and its intended outcomes or outputs are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015⁴ (or the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document⁵ for Programmes approved before November 2010) and the corporate plans of the three participating UN Organizations. Relevance vis-a-vis other REDD+ or REDD+-related programmes implemented in the country should also be examined.
- ii) **Effectiveness**, measure the extent of which the National Programme's intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which progress towards outputs or outcomes has been achieved. Two components will be measured:
 - a) **Assessment of processes that affected the attainment of project results** – which looks at examination of preparation and readiness of the project, country ownership, stakeholder involvement, financial planning, effectiveness of national and local implementing agencies and designated supervision agency, coordination mechanism with other relevant donors projects/programmes, and reasons for any bottlenecks and delays in delivery of project outputs, outcomes and the attainment of sustainability.
 - b) **Implementation approach** - including an analysis of the project's result framework, performance indicators, adaptation to changing conditions, overall project management and mechanisms applied in project management in delivering project outcomes and outputs.
- iii) **Efficiency**, measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to achieving stipulated outcomes and outputs.
- iv) **Sustainability**, analyse the likelihood of sustainable outcomes at programme termination, with attention to sustainability of financial resources, the socio-political environment, catalytic or replication effects of the project, institutional and governance factors, and environmental risks.
- v) **Impact**, measures to what extent the National Programme has contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, changes in the governance systems, stakeholder behaviour and capacity and social and environmental improvements.

2.2 Evaluation Questions

The following list includes standard questions and issues that the UN-REDD National Programme evaluation should address. It is based on the internationally accepted evaluation criteria mentioned above, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as an additional category of questions regarding factors affecting programme performance. The evaluation will assess the Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme as follows:

⁴ The UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015 is available on:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4598&Itemid=53

⁵ The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document is available on:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53

i) Relevance

a) The National Programme's relevance to:

- Country needs;
 - National development priorities as expressed in national policies and plans as well as in sector development frameworks;
 - UN Country Programme or other donor assistance framework approved by the government;
 - The Regulation of the President of the Republic of Indonesia number 61 year 2011 regarding National Action Plan on the Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions (*Peraturan Presiden No.61/2011 tentang Rencana Aksi Nasional Penurunan Emisi Gas Rumah Kaca – RAN GRK*);
 - The Decree of the President of the Republic of Indonesia number 25 year 2011 regarding the Task Force for the preparation of REDD+ Agency (*Keputusan Presiden No.25/2011 tentang Satuan Tugas Persiapan Kelembagaan REDD+*);
 - The Instruction of the President of the Republic of Indonesia number 10 year 2011 regarding the Delay of New License and the Improvement of Primary and Peatland Natural Forest Governance (*Instruksi Presiden No.10/2011 tentang Penundaan Pemberian Izin Baru dan Penyempurnaan Tata Kelola Hutan Alam Primer dan Lahan Gambut*).
 - The Decree of Minister of Forestry number 2771/Menhut-VII/IPSDH/2012 regarding the Decision of Indicative Map on the Delay of New License for Forest Utilization, Forest Area Use and Change of Forest Use and other Forest Area Functions (*Keputusan Menteri Kehutanan RI No. SK 2771/Menhut-VII/IPSDH/2012 tentang Penetapan Peta Indikatif Penundaan Pemberian Izin Baru Pemanfaatan Hutan, Penggunaan Kawasan Hutan dan Perubahan Peruntukan Kawasan Hutan dan Areal Penggunaan Lain*);
 - Draft of REDD+ National Strategy;
 - The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document⁶;
 - Other REDD+ related programmes in the country.
- b) Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the National Programme, including logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts against the specific and development objectives and validity of indicators, assumptions and risks.
- c) Quality and realism of the National Programme design, including:
- Duration;
 - Stakeholder and beneficiary identification;
 - Institutional set-up and management arrangements;
 - Overall programme results' framework
 - Approach and methodology.
- d) Evolution of National Programme objectives since programme formulation.

ii) Effectiveness

- e) Extent to which the expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness.
- f) Extent to which the expected outcomes have been achieved.
- g) Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the National Programme. This will cover:
 - Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in Programme objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
 - Analysis of how gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative;

⁶ The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document is available on:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53

- Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in Programme management.
- Assessment of likely distribution of benefits and costs between stakeholders.
- h) Actual and potential contribution of the National Programme to the normative work of the three participating UN Organizations, e.g. contribution towards the “Delivering as One” initiative and lessons learned incorporated into broader organizational strategies.

iii) Efficiency

- i) The evaluation will assess factors and processes that affected project results with particular attention to preparation and readiness of the project, country ownership, and stakeholder involvement, effectiveness of national and local implementing agencies, financial planning and management and coordination mechanisms.
- j) Financial resources management of the National Programme, including:
 - Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs;
 - Coherence and soundness of budget revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives;
 - Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation.
 - Gaps and delays if any between planned and achieved outputs, the causes and consequences of delays and assessment of any remedial measures taken;
- k) Management and implementation of the National Programme, including:
 - Efficiency in producing outputs;
 - Efficiency of fund-management arrangements.

iv) Sustainability

- l) Major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme.
- m) The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the National Programme’s results by the beneficiaries after the termination of the initiative. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
 - Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
 - Perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the National Programme.

v) Impact

- n) Overall performance of the National Programme: extent to which the initiative has attained, or is expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives; this will also include the identification of actual and potential positive and negative impacts produced by the initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.⁷
- o) Use made by the National Programme of the UN-REDD Programme’s normative products, guidelines and safeguards, e.g. the UN-REDD Programme Guidelines on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness, and the extent of which they have contributed towards national safeguards⁸.

vi) Factors affecting performance

- p) Assessment of coordination mechanisms and decisions taken between the three participating UN organizations to ensure joint delivery.

⁷ The Theory of Change will be used to review the progress towards impacts, by applying the ROTI methodology assessing the likelihood of impact achievement (Annex 6).

⁸ None of the guidelines referred to were available during most of the period of programme implementation.

- q) Assessment of coordination mechanisms and decisions taken between the Government and the three participating UN organizations to ensure programme outcomes are achieved.
- r) Assessment of coordination within and between Government ministries in order to ensure programme outcomes is achieved.
- s) Assessment of coordination mechanisms between the National Programme and other bilateral and multilateral REDD+ initiatives.
- t) Management and implementation of the National Programme, including:
 - Efficiency of management, including quality and realism of work plans;
 - Efficiency and of operations management;
 - Efficiency of coordination and steering bodies (if any);
 - Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by the three participating UN Organizations; and
 - Timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and support by the Government and partners.

3. Evaluation Methodology

The UN-REDD National Programme final evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards⁹. It will be conducted by two independent consultants under the overall responsibility and management of the three participating UN Organizations' Evaluation Departments through their participation in the Evaluation Management Group, in consultation with relevant headquarter, regional and country staff of the participating UN Organizations.

Evaluation findings and judgements should be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the evaluation report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) to the extent possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned¹⁰. Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out. The limitations of the methodological framework should also be spelled out in the evaluation reports.

The evaluation will assess the programme with respect to a minimum set of evaluation criteria using the table for rating performance in Annex 6.

In attempting to attribute any outcomes and impacts to the programme, the evaluators should consider the difference between what has happened with and what would have happened without the programme. This implies that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended programme outcomes and impacts. This also means that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project. Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluators, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

As this is a final evaluation, particular attention should be given to learning from the experience. Therefore, the "why?" question should be at the front of the consultants' minds throughout the evaluation exercise. This means that the consultants need to go beyond the assessment of "what" the programme performance was, and make a serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of "why" the performance turned out the way it did, i.e. of processes affecting attainment of

⁹UNEG Norms & Standards: <http://uneval.org/normsandstandards>

¹⁰ Individuals should not be mentioned by name if anonymity needs to be preserved. In such cases sources can be expressed in generic term (Government, NGO, donor etc.).

programme results. This should provide the basis for the lessons that can be drawn from the programme. In fact, the usefulness of the evaluation will be determined to a large extent by the capacity of the consultant to explain “why things happened” as they happened and are likely to evolve in this or that direction, which goes well beyond the mere assessment of “where things stand” today. The consultant could also provide recommendations for the way forward.

4.2 Tools

The Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme final evaluation will make use of the following tools:

- a) A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - Relevant background documentation, including the UN-REDD Programme Framework Document¹¹;
 - Relevant reports, such as National Programme Annual, Semi-Annual and quarterly Reports, Year in Review publication, external evaluations by donors, partners etc.;
 - Project design documents, such as the National Programme Document, annual work plans and budgets, revisions to the logical framework and project financing;
 - Documentation related to National Programme outputs and relevant materials published on the Programme website;
 - Other relevant documents, such as possible new national policy documents, sector plans and available evaluations bearing relevance for UN-REDD.
- b) Semi-structured interviews¹² with key informants, stakeholders and participants, including:
 - Government counterpart;
 - Government stakeholders including all ministries participating from coordinating bodies or steering committees;
 - Civil Society Organizations;
 - Indigenous Peoples Organizations;
 - Country , regional and headquarter personnel from the three UN-Agencies involved in the National Programme, e.g. the Programme Management Unit, Resident Coordination and Regional Technical Advisers;
 - Representatives from other bi-lateral or multi-lateral initiatives co-financing the NP if applicable.
- c) The Theory of Change and subsequent application of the ROTl approach on progress towards impact¹³.

A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted is included in Annex 5.

5 Consultation process

The Evaluation Team will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders. Throughout the process the evaluation team will maintain close liaison with: the Evaluation Management Group (Consisting of representatives of the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat), the Programme Management

¹¹ The UN-REDD Programme Framework Document is available on:

http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4&Itemid=53

¹² Face-to-face or through any other appropriate means of communications

¹³ GEF Evaluation Office, (OPS4) Progress towards Impacts: The ROTl Handbook: Towards enhancing the impacts of environmental projects – Methodological paper 2.

Unit, UN headquarters, regional, sub-regional and country level staff members, and other key stakeholders. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or the participating UN Organizations.

The draft evaluation report will be circulated among the three participating UN Organizations, including the Evaluation Management Group, and other key stakeholders for comment before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

6 The Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team should consist of two evaluators, including one team leader. The Team Leader will have sound evaluation experience. The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme. Knowledge of the country in question, good technical understanding of the REDD+ field, as well as competence and skills in evaluation will be required. To the extent possible the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

The Evaluation Team members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the initiative. All members of the Evaluation Team will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct¹⁴ Agreement Form (Annex 3).

The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation and applying the methodology. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs.

7 Evaluation Team Deliverables

7.2 Inception Report

Before going into data collection the Evaluation Team shall prepare an *inception report* containing a thorough review of the project design quality and the evaluation framework. The *inception report* should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how the evaluation questions can be answered by way of: proposed methods and sources of data, as well as data collection procedures. The *inception report* should also include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, as well as a desk based Theory of Change of the programme¹⁵. The evaluation framework should summarize the information available from programme documentation against each of the main evaluation parameters. Any gaps in information should be identified and methods for additional data collection, verification and analysis should be specified. The evaluation framework will present in further detail the evaluation questions under each criterion with their respective indicators and data sources. This will allow the three participating UN Organizations to verify that there is a shared understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstandings at the outset. A list of important documents and web pages that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report is included in Annex 4. The Inception Report will be shared with the three participating UN Organizations and other relevant stakeholders and reviewed by the Evaluation Management Group.

¹⁴ UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system: www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct

¹⁵ GEF Evaluation Office, (OPS4) Progress towards Impacts: The ROTI Handbook: Towards enhancing the impacts of environmental projects – Methodological paper 2.

7.3 Evaluation Report

The reviewers shall prepare a *draft evaluation report*. The Team Leader bears responsibility for submitting the draft report to the UNREDD Secretariat within three weeks from the conclusion of the mission, and the Secretariat will immediately transmit the draft report to the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations. The evaluation departments will verify that the draft report meets their evaluation quality standards and may request a revision of the draft report by the consultants before it is shared with a wider audience. The draft evaluation report will then be circulated among the three participating UN Organizations, including the Evaluation Management Group, and other key stakeholders for comments. Comments will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team. The consultants will prepare a *response to comments* in the form of a table listing all comments rejected by the evaluation team with an explanation why.

The *final evaluation report* will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the Terms of Reference. The length of the final evaluation report should be 15-18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

The Evaluation Team shall propose the outline of the report in the inception report, based on the template provided in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference. The report shall be prepared in English, and translated into French and Spanish.

Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Additional methodology-related documentation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of programme outputs/Programme results framework;
- Evaluation tools.

The Evaluation Team is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government or the three participating UN Organizations. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by the evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations, but has to meet the quality standards for evaluation of the three Organizations. The final report will be published on the UN-REDD Programme web site (www.un-redd.org).

8. Evaluation timetable and budget

Table 3 outlines the tentative timetable and responsibility of the evaluation process. The timetable will be adjusted according to the availability of the selected consultant.

Table 3: Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme Evaluation Timeline

Date:	Activity	Responsibility
January 2013	Draft National Programme Final Evaluation Terms of Reference (draft to be based on the	The UN-REDD Secretariat prepares the first draft of the Evaluation ToR, and shares it with the three participating UN Organizations for comments.

	“National Programme Final Evaluation Template”)	The National Programme staff should ensure the draft Terms of Reference is shared with the Government counterpart and other relevant key stakeholders for information and their comments.
January 2013	Review National Programme Final Evaluation Terms of Reference	Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation Departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat)
February 2013	Recruit consultants	National Programme Evaluation budget holder in consultation with the Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat)
4-8 March 2013	Preparation of Inception Report (5 days)	Evaluation Team (consultants) Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations National Programme staff
11-18 March 2012 (TBC)	Review inception report (one week)	The three participating UN Organizations and the Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat)
18 March-15 April 2013 (TBC)	Evaluation Mission (21 days)	Evaluation Team (consultants) Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations’ National Programme staff. Also, a one day debriefing workshop with stakeholders should be held at the end of the Evaluation Mission.
15 April-29 April 2013 (TBC)	Draft Evaluation Report (8/10 days)	Evaluation Team (consultants) Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations National Programme staff
29 April -10 May 2013 (TBC)	Review Draft Evaluation Report by participating UN Organizations (10 days)	The three participating UN Organizations and the Evaluation Management Group (Evaluation departments of the three participating UN Organizations and the UN-REDD Secretariat) reviews the draft from the point of view of its evaluation quality and make comments to the Evaluation Team in that respect. If need be, the evaluation team will revise the draft report. The latter will be then circulated to other stakeholders for comment.
May 2013 (TBC)	Review Draft Evaluation Report by Government Counterpart and other stakeholders (two weeks)	The National Programme staff should ensure the Draft Evaluation Report is shared with the Government Counterpart and other relevant key stakeholders for information and their comments.
May 2013 (TBC)	Final Report (2/4 days)	Evaluation Team (consultants) Logistical support provided by the participating UN Organizations National Programme staff
June 2013 (TBC)	Management response from the Participating UN Organizations (one month)	Participating UN Organizations
June 2013 (TBC)	Management response from the Government Counterpart (one month)	Government Counterpart

(TBC)	Dissemination of the report	The UN country offices on the national level and the UN-REDD Programme Secretariat on the global level.
-------	-----------------------------	---

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION CONSULTANCIES TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Evaluation Team should consist of two evaluators, including one team leader. The Team Leader must have sound evaluation experience. The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme, and ideally include in-depth knowledge of the National Programme country in question, good technical understanding of REDD+, as well as competence and skills in evaluation. To the extent possible the Evaluation Team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

The Evaluation Team members shall have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the National Programme. All members of the Evaluation Team will sign the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct¹⁶ Agreement Form (Annex 3).

The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation and applying the methodology. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs. The Evaluation Team shall collaborate on a single document for each of the three main deliverables (inception report, draft report and final report), while the Team Leader is responsible for consolidating the reports and ensuring all deadlines are met.

Competences:

- Independent from the UN-REDD Programme and the participating UN Organizations, FAO, UNEP and UNDP.
- The evaluation team should comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the National Programme, including:
 - Good technical understanding of REDD+;
 - Preferably in-depth knowledge of Indonesia.
- Demonstrate experience from evaluations of similar types of programmes.
- Excellent writing and editing skills.
- Attention to detail and respect for timelines.

Qualifications:

- Advanced university degree in relevant field.
- Minimum 11 (team leader)/7 (team leader assistant) years of professional experience is required, longer professional experience is an advantage, including proven experience from developing countries.
- Fluency in English language, both written and spoken is a requirement. Knowledge of local language would be a distinctive advantage.

¹⁶ UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system: www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct

Deliverables:

- Prepare an inception report;
- Produce a consolidated draft report that meets the quality requirements of the evaluation departments of the three participating UN agencies. The team leader is responsible for consolidating the report;
- Prepare a response to comments received from stakeholders on the draft report;
- Produce a consolidated final report. The team leader is responsible for consolidating the report.

Application:

- Applications to be sent as per UNOPS instructions.

Schedule of Payment:

Deliverables	Percentage payment to Consultant One (Team leader):	Percentage payment to Consultant Two:
Inception report	12.5%	13.9
Submission and approval of the draft evaluation report	25%	22.2%
Submission and approval of the final evaluation report	62.5%	63.9%

The Evaluation Team can modify the structure of the report outline below, as long as the key contents are maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis is coherent and clear. The length of the UN-REDD National Programme final evaluation report should be 15-18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes.

Acknowledgements

Insert acknowledgements.

Composition of the Evaluation Team

Insert description of the composition of the Evaluation Team.

Table of Contents

Insert Table of Contents.

Acronyms

When an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained in full; it will be included in the list of acronyms when it is used repeatedly within the report.

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should:

- Be in length approximately 10-15% of the main report, excluding annexes;
- Provide key information on the evaluation process and methodology;
- Illustrate key findings and conclusions;
- List all recommendations: this will facilitate the drafting of the Management Response to the evaluation.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation

This section will include:

- The purpose of the evaluation, as stated in the Terms of Reference;
- National Programme title, starting and closing dates, initial and current total budget;
- Dates of implementation of the evaluation.

It will also mention that Annex I of the evaluation report is the evaluation Terms of Reference.

1.2 Methodology of the evaluation

This section will comprise a description of the methodology and tools used and evaluation criteria that were applied by the evaluation. This should also note any limitations incurred in applying the methodology by the evaluation team.

2. Context of the National Programme

This section will include a description of the developmental context relevant to the National Programme including major challenges in the area of the intervention, political and legislative issues,

etc. It will also describe the process by which the programme was identified and developed and cite other related and bilateral interventions if relevant.

3. Concept and relevance

3.1 Design

National Programmes are built on assumptions on how and why they are supposed to achieve the agreed objectives through the selected strategy; this set of assumptions constitutes the programme theory or 'theory of change' and can be explicit (e.g. in a logical framework matrix) or implicit in a programme document.

This section will include a diagram and short description of the programme theory of change, including its results chains from outputs to impact, impact drivers and assumptions and will analyse critically:

- The appropriateness of stated development goals and outcomes (immediate objectives);
- The causal relationship between, outputs, outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives);
- The extent to which drivers for change have been recognized and supported by the programme;
- The relevance and appropriateness of indicators;
- The validity of assumptions and risks.

This section will also critically assess:

- The programme's institutional set-up and management arrangements;
- The adequacy of the time-frame for implementation;
- The adequacy of resources from all parties and appropriateness of budget allocations to achieve intended results;
- The adequacy of the methodology of implementation to achieve intended results;
- The quality of the stakeholders' and beneficiaries identification.

3.2 Relevance

This section will analyse the extent to which the National Programme's objectives and strategy were consistent with country's expressed requirements and policies, with beneficiaries' needs, and other programmes, at the time of approval and at the time of the evaluation.

There will also be an analysis of the degree to which the programme corresponds to priorities in the UN-REDD Programme Strategy.

4. Results and contribution to stated objectives

4.1 Outputs and outcomes

This section will critically analyse the National Programme outputs: ideally, the evaluation team should directly assess all of these, but this is not always feasible due to time and resources constraints. Thus, the detailed analysis should be done on a representative sample of outputs that were assessed directly, while a complete list of outputs prepared by the programme team should be included as annex. If appropriate, the section will also include an analysis of gaps and delays and their causes and consequences.

Further, the section will critically analyse to what extent expected outcomes (specific/immediate objectives) were achieved. It will also identify and analyse the main factors influencing their achievement and the contributions of the various stakeholders to them.

4.2 Gender issues

This section will analyse if and how the programme mainstreamed gender issues. The assessment will cover:

- Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
- Analysis of how gender relations and equality and processes of women's inclusion were and are likely to be affected by the initiative;
- Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in programme management.

4.3 Capacity development

The evaluation will assess:

- The extent and quality of programme work in capacity development of beneficiaries;
- The perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the programme.

4.4 Sustainability

This section will assess the prospects for long-term use of outputs and outcomes, from an institutional, social, technical and economic perspective. If applicable, there will also be an analysis of environmental sustainability (maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base).

4.5 Impact

This section will assess the current and foreseeable positive and negative impacts produced as a result of the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. It will assess the actual or potential contribution of the programme to the planned development objective and to UN-REDD strategic objectives, described in the UN-REDD Programme Strategy 2011-2015.

5. Implementation

5.1 Budget and Expenditure

This section will contain the analysis of the National Programme financial resources and management, including:

- Efficiency in production of outputs;
- Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching implementation needs and programme objectives; and
- Assessment of rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation, compared to the initial plan.

5.2 Programme Management

This section will analyse the performance of the management function, including:

- Efficiency and effectiveness of operations management, both within the programme and by the participating UN Organizations, including timeliness, quality, reasons for delays and assessment of remedial measures taken if any;
- Effectiveness of strategic decision-making by programme management;
- Realism of annual work-plans;
- Efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring system and internal evaluation processes;
- Elaboration and implementation of an exit strategy;
- Role and effectiveness of institutional set-up, including steering bodies;

5.3 Technical Backstopping

This section will analyse the extent, timeliness and quality of technical backstopping the programme received from involved units in the participating UN Organizations, at all levels (headquarter, regional, sub-regional and country offices).

5.4 Government's participation

This section will analyse government's commitment and support to the programme, in particular:

- Financial and human resources made available for programme operations;
- Uptake of outputs and outcomes through policy or investment for up-scaling.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues. They may address specific evaluation questions raised in the Terms of Reference and should provide a clear basis for the recommendations which follow.

The Conclusions will synthesise the main findings from the preceding sections: main achievements, major weaknesses and gaps in implementation, factors affecting strengths and weaknesses, prospects for follow-up, any emerging issues. It will consolidate the assessment of various aspects to judge the extent to which the programme has attained, or is expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives. Considerations about relevance, costs, implementation strategy and quantity and quality of outputs and outcomes should be brought to bear on the aggregate final assessment.

The section will include an assessment of the three participating UN Organizations role as implementing organizations and the quality of the feedback loop between the programme and the organizations' normative role, namely:

- Actual use by the programme of relevant participating UN Organizations' normative products (databases, publications, methodologies, etc.);
- Actual and potential contribution of programme outputs and outcomes to the participating UN Organizations normative work.

Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. They can tackle strategic, thematic or operational issues. Recommendations concerned with on-going activities should be presented separately from those relating to follow-up once the National Programme is terminated. Each recommendation should each

be introduced by the rationale for it; alternatively, it should be referenced to the paragraphs in the report to which it is linked.

Each recommendation should be clearly addressed to the appropriate party (ies), i.e. the Government and the Participating UN Organizations at different levels (headquarter, regional, and national). Responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation should be stated, to the extent possible. Although it is not possible to identify a 'correct' number of recommendations in an evaluation report, the evaluation team should consider that each recommendation must receive a response.

7. Lessons Learned

The evaluation will identify lessons and good practices on substantive, methodological or procedural issues, which could be relevant to the design, implementation and evaluation of similar projects or programmes, especially future UN-REDD activities and programmes in Viet-Nam. Such lessons/practices must have been innovative, demonstrated success, had an impact, and be replicable.

Annexes to the evaluation report

I. Evaluation Terms of Reference

II. Brief profile of evaluation team members

III. List of documents reviewed

IV. List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process

The team will decide whether to report the full name and/or the function of the people who were interviewed in this list.

V. List of programme outputs

This includes training events, meetings, reports/publications, initiatives supported through the programme. It should be prepared by the programme staff, in a format decided by the evaluation team, when details cannot be provided in the main text because too cumbersome.

VI. Evaluation tools

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT¹⁷ AGREEMENT FORM

The form is to be completed by all consultants and included as an annex in the final report.

<p style="text-align: center;">Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form</p> <p>Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System</p> <p>Name of Consultant: _____</p> <p>I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.</p> <p>Signed at (place) on (date)</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>
--

¹⁷ Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System: www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX 4: DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSULTED

The following list of documents should be consulted by the evaluators at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design and the inception report:

- The regulation of the President of the Republic Indonesia number 61/2011 regarding National Action Plan on the Reduction of GHG emissions.
- UN-REDD Programme Strategy:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=4598&Itemid=53
- Signed Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme Document (prodoc) by UNDP, FAO, UNEP and Ministry of Forestry:
http://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=3276&Itemid=53
- Indonesia UN-REDD National Programme Annual and Semi-Annual Reports:
<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/project/00073509>
- Relevant documents under REDD+ Indonesia website:
<http://www.un-redd.or.id/>
- Other relevant documents:
 - Programme Executive Board meeting minutes.
 - Draft of REDD+ National Strategy.
 - Etc.

ANNEX 5: KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PARTNERS

The following list of key stakeholders and other individuals should be consulted:

Name	Affiliation	Relevance	Contact information
Indonesia Government			
Hadi Daryanto, Mr.	Min of Forestry	Secretary General	
Heru Prasetyo, Mr.	UKP4/ REDD+ Task Force	National Programme Director of REDD+	
Agus Purnomo, Mr.	DNPI	Secretary	
Yetti Rusli, Ms.	Min of Forestry	Director General	
Basah Hernowo	BAPPENAS	Director	
Yuyu Rahayu, Mr.	Min of Forestry	National Programme Director (NPD) of UN-REDD	yrahayu48@yahoo.com
Ruandha Agung Sugardiman, Mr.	Min of Forestry	Deputy NPD	ra.sugardiman@gmail.com
Nahardi, Mr.	Min of Forestry	Head of Provincial Office	
Agus Justianto, Mr.	Min of Forestry	Chief of Training Centre	
Nurmasripatin, Ms.	Min of Forestry	Expert	
Farid, Mr.	DNPI	Expert	
Dodi Sukadri, Mr.	DNPI	Expert	
Farhan, Mr.	DNPI	Expert	
UN-REDD Indonesia Secretariat (PMU)			
Laksmi Banowati	PMU	National Project Manager (NPM)	banowatilaksmi@yahoo.com
Machfudh	PMU	Consultant	mfood2003@yahoo.com
Hermawan Indrabudi	PMU	Consultant	indrabudi@hotmail.com
Agus Hernadi	PMU	Consultant	agushernadi@yahoo.com
Participating UN Organizations			
Ben Vickers	FAO	Regional Office	Ben.Vickers@fao.org
Roger Klavier	FAO	Indonesia	Rogier.klaver@fao.org
Danilo Mollicone	FAO		
María Sanz-Sánchez	FAO		
Tim Boyle	UNDP	Regional Office	timothy.boyle@undp.org
Budhi Sayoko	UNDP	Indonesia	budhi.sayoko@undp.org +62-815-145-14994
Anton Sri Probiyantono	UNDP	Indonesia	anton.probiyantono@undp.org +62-811-920-3435
Thomas Enters	UNEP	Regional Office	enters@un.org
Andri Akbar Marthen	UNEP	Indonesia	greenlaw.indonesia@gmail.com
Non-Governmental Organizations			
Rizal Macfud, Mr.	AMAN (Alliance of Indigenous Peoples in Indonesia) Palu		
Rukmini Paata, Ms.	OPANT-Palu		rukmini_opant@yahoo.com

Name	Affiliation	Relevance	Contact information
Nike, Ms.	FCPF		
Steni	HUMA		
Mina Setra	AMAN		
Barbara, Ms.	GIZ		
Amran Tambaru, Mr.	YPM Palu		
Rahmat "Oyong" Saleh	Perkumpulan Karsa Palu		
Donor/Bilateral projects			
Joar Strand, Mr.	Embassy of Norway		
Hege, Ms.	Embassy of Norway		
Tim Brown, Mr.	World Bank		
Guntur, Mr.	World Bank		
Universities			
Dodik, Mr.	Bogor Institute of Agriculture (IPB)	Lecturer/ expert	
Rauf, Mr.	University of Tadulako (Untad)	Lecturer/ expert	
Fajar, Mr.	University of Mulawarman (Unmul)	Lecturer/ expert	
Ani Mardiasuti, Ms.	IPB	Lecturer/ expert	
Golar, Mr.	Untad	Lecturer/ expert	
Henry Barus, Mr.	Untad	Lecturer/ expert	

ANNEX 6: RATING PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE

Criteria		Comments
Agency Coordination and implementation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Agency coordination</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Project Supervision</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Relevance:</i> relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2pt. scale)	
<i>Effectiveness</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Efficiency</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Financial resources</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Socio-economic</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Institutional framework and governance</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Environmental</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Overall Programme Results	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, project implementation:	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR) Impact Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) ; Unable to Assess (U/A)		