

SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final Evaluation of EU Support to Indonesia's Climate Change Response - Technical Cooperation Component

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 1: Sustainable management of Natural Resources and resilience

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

CRIS: ACA/2011/022-499

Contracting Authority: European Union Delegation to Indonesia

1	BACKGROUND	2
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY / REGION / SECTOR BACKGROUND	2
1.2	THE ACTION TO BE EVALUATED	3
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE ACTION	4
1.4	OTHER AVAILABLE INFORMATION	4
2	DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT	5
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	5
2.2	REQUESTED SERVICES	6
2.3	PHASES OF THE EVALUATION AND REQUIRED OUTPUTS	8
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER)	12
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION	12
2.6	LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT	12
3	EXPERTISE REQUIRED	13
3.1	NUMBER OF EXPERTS AND OF WORKING DAYS PER CATEGORY	13
3.2	EXPERTISE REQUIRED	13
3.3	PRESENCE OF MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR BRIEFING AND/OR DEBRIEFING	14
4	LOCATION AND DURATION	14
4.1	STARTING PERIOD	14
4.2	FORESEEN DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT IN CALENDAR DAYS	14
4.3	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF	14
4.4	LOCATION(S) OF ASSIGNMENT	14
5	REPORTING	14
5.1	CONTENT, TIMING AND SUBMISSION	14
5.2	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS	15
5.3	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS	15
5.4	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	16
5.5	LANGUAGE	16
5.6	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES	16
5.7	FORMATTING OF REPORTS	16
	ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	17
	ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM	18
	ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	19
	ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE	21
	ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID	22
	ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)	26

1 BACKGROUND

From a low-income country in the mid-1960s, Indonesia transformed itself into a middle-income country in the mid-nineties. The country achieved an average annual growth close to 6% since 2003. Indonesia has resisted relatively well the recent global financial and economic crisis. However the strong growth rate has so far only partly translated into reductions in poverty and unemployment (around 16% and 9% respectively) which remain high and progress towards the Millennium Development Goals is mixed.

There is growing understanding of the importance of the natural environment –and the services it provides, in particular to forests and coastal communities- for Indonesia's development model, which remains strongly reliant on extraction and exports of natural resources, commodities and on cheap labour. However, environment degradation is rapid and, as an archipelagic nation, Indonesia is among the most vulnerable countries to climate change and has a lot to lose if no action is taken.

Carbon stocks in Indonesia's forests and peat lands mean that the country is candidate to funding from climate change mechanisms such as Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+). This prospect, together with growing awareness on the importance of environmentally sustainable practices in several sectors of the economy, have translated into the adoption of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction objectives¹ and the formulation of low emission development strategies at national and provincial level, providing a favourable context for international climate change cooperation in the country. Indonesia's emission reduction ambitions are coupled with a 7% GDP growth objective.

Despite its relatively low GDP per capita Indonesia is one of the top 5-top 10 largest emitters of greenhouse gases (GHG). For the past two decades, GHG emissions have increased from almost all sectors, such as land-use (defined as land use, land-use change, and forestry, including peat fires), energy, agriculture, industry, and waste. Currently, the land-use sector dominates GHG emissions in Indonesia, but the energy sector's share is projected to increase to over 50 percent of total emissions by 2026–2027.

1.1 Relevant country / region / sector background

Indonesia produced an estimated 1.8 gigatons in 2005 and 1.4 gigatons in 2000. Regional EU-ASEAN cooperation on the Paris Agreement aims at addressing climate change impacts, air pollution (haze), sea level rise, adaptation and mitigation of GHG emissions, and at improving transparency and comparability in order to eventually increase peer pressure and ambition, embedded in medium (2030) and longer term (2050 carbon neutrality) national strategies.

A recent WRI report² analyses GHG emissions from Indonesian land-use and energy sectors and compares emission levels expected under a baseline projection through 2030 with emissions that might result from existing and strengthened mitigation measures in the two sectors. Indonesia has pledged to reduce its emissions growth by at least 29% over business-as-usual levels by 2030. That means it can emit no more than 2 gigatons of carbon dioxide that year. But even if it followed through on existing policies the country would still emit 2.3 gigatons of carbon in 2030, a 19% percent drop. The paper concludes said emissions will overshoot the target associated with the country's unconditional 2030 commitment to a 29% reduction.

Reducing emissions to meet Indonesia's conditional target of a 41 percent reduction below business-as-usual levels would require much stronger efforts, including implementing energy conservation programs, and pursuing mitigation measures for other sectors and gases.

¹ *Reductions by 26% by 2020 against business as usual projections (up to 41% with international support)*

² <http://www.wri-indonesia.org/sites/default/files/WRI%20Layout%20Paper%20OCN%20v7.pdf>

1.2 The Action to be evaluated³

Title of the Action to be evaluated	Support To Indonesia's Climate Change Response- Technical Cooperation Component (SICCR – TAC)
Budget of the Action to be evaluated	EUR 6,498,000
CRIS number of the Action to be evaluated	No DCI-ASIE/2015/371-538
Dates of the Action to be evaluated	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Start: 1 February 2016• End: 31 January 2019

The objective of this Support To Indonesia's Climate Change Response Technical Assistance Component(SICCR-TAC, EUR 6,498,000, 2016-2019) project is to contribute in an effective and coherent way to the achievement of the national Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+ strategy) by designing and mainstream provincial REDD+ strategies with existing development planning frameworks. This shall be done by implementing and monitoring a sustainable, participatory, transparent, low-carbon and economically sound land-use concept with focus in the province of Aceh. The project will design strategies to generate valuable experiences for further regional and national discussions by contributing lessons learned from the field to the national and international exchange on REDD+ experiences.

On its third year, the project has shown a good progress implementing the planned activities;. At the national level, the project supported the development of a roadmap strengthening all five regional units under the Directorate General of Climate Change (DGCC). The roadmap was prepared in a five days' workshop with DGCC regional divisions. The project conceptualized the Capacity Building and Technology Needs Assessment (CBTNA). The CBTNA is a study to gather, evaluate, prioritize, and update information on capacity building and technology needs for reaching climate change targets set out in the Paris Agreement ratified by Indonesia.

On provincial level, the project supported the preparation of the Provincial Development (RPJMA). With the election the new Governor of Aceh, the province renewed its commitment to green economic development, further demonstrated by the request to draft a preliminary plan for the development of the next medium-term development plan of Aceh (RPJMA). The five-year provincial development plan (RPJMA) includes annual work and budget plans. With project support, the "RPJMA" now reflects climate change commitments and targets in the official planning and budgeting framework governing provincial policies of the next five years.

At district level, SICCR TAC supported the preparation of one District Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMD). Project work in the district of Pidie ensured that the sub-provincial planning process includes targets/guidelines of the Provincial "Green" Development Plan ("Green" RPJMA") to further capture district innovations in green economy.

³ The term 'Action' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

1.3 Stakeholders of the Action

the auspices of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF), represented by the Directorate General of Climate Change (DGCC) (<http://ditjenppi.menlhk.go.id/>) as the main national stakeholder, and the Government of Aceh (GoA) represented by the Aceh Provincial Forestry Service, as the main local stakeholder. Furthermore, this project aims to involve local stakeholders in its planning as well as implementation of project activities.

1.4 Other available information

There are numerous initiatives from the Government of Indonesia and development partners to consolidate and implement the country's climate change strategy. Improving the overall coherence and the complementarities of all existing and planned actions is a key challenge of the Government and its development partners. Key programs include:

- At national level, some of the key initiatives include the Indonesia-Norway Letter of Intent with an allocation of US\$1 billion (largely on a "payment for results" basis), the Indonesian Climate Change Trust Fund to finance government initiatives, the Indonesia Green Investment Fund to scale up public and private investment, and the Indonesian Clean Technology Fund, an Indonesian unit of a multi-donor Trust Fund within the World Bank's Climate Investment Funds. Many REDD+ preparation projects have been implemented or are currently ongoing with support from governments (e.g. Australia, Germany, Korea), UN Agencies, NGOs (e.g. Fauna and Flora International, The Nature Conservancy, World Wide Fund for Nature), and private groups.
- The UK's Department for International Development (DFID) has been supporting Indonesia's Ministry of Forestry since 2008 through the Multi-stakeholder Forestry Programme (MFP). This aims to facilitate the development and implementation of a timber licensing agreement and assist small and medium enterprises to meet EU timber legality assurance standards that apply from March 2013 under the EU Timber Regulation. A new phase of the programme, "MFP3", aims to extend current support Indonesia's preparations to enter the EU-Indonesia VPA (Voluntary Partnership Agreement) and concrete implementation of the VPA. In addition to ensuring that all components of Indonesia's Timber Legality Assurance System (Sistem Verifikasi Legalitas Kayu – SVLK) are implemented across Indonesia the MFP3 also addresses other factors essential for VPA implementation such as assisting the Government implement policies to address tenure to forest land and to allocate resources to community-based forest enterprises. This includes mechanisms for multi-stakeholder involvement in demarcation and building the capacity of enterprises that are granted tenure to operate profitably and legally within the framework of the SVLK. Through the above activities the MFP3 aims to contribute to providing support to tackle the drivers of deforestation in the forest and land use sectors. This will in turn help shift Indonesia's management of its forest sector onto a more sustainable path, protect the livelihoods of poor people, and help reduce global carbon emissions.
- The EU is implementing various forestry and climate change actions in Indonesia which provide lessons and synergy opportunities for its new action in Aceh. This includes the progressive implementation of a FLEGT VPA⁴ Action Plan, which can contribute to REDD+ by promoting improvements in forest governance, reducing illegal logging and associated degradation of forests and supporting community forest enterprises, as well as mechanisms for assuring access to forest resources and clarity of tenure for forest dependent communities.⁵ Efforts to promote sustainable practices in the palm oil industry -through dialogue on the EU's Renewable Energy Directive-

⁴ Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Voluntary Partnership Agreement.

⁵The KPH/Forest Management Units promoted by the Ministry of Forestry, World Bank, GIZ and others would appear to be particularly suitable vehicles in this regard.

are also relevant to REDD+ since practices in the palm oil industry will contribute to determine how Indonesia achieves its emission reduction targets. Other relevant actions include the ALLREDDI⁶ project (now concluded) to build capacities for carbon assessments, cooperation on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) with the Ministry of Environment, the "SWITCH Asia" programme to promote Sustainable Consumption and Production, and various projects funded under the EU's Environment and Natural Resources Thematic Program.

- In Aceh specifically, USAID implements the Indonesia Forestry and Climate Support Project (IFACS) supporting district level authorities. Germany's Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW) conducted in 2010 a feasibility study on "maintaining one of Asia's largest carbon sinks - the Leuser Ecosystem" and is planning to finance a \$11million project for biodiversity conservation and climate protection in the Leuser ecosystem, after the closing of the World Bank's 6-year programme (2006-2012) which aimed at integrating environment and forest protection into Aceh's post-tsunami recovery efforts. With EU funding, FFI implemented the action "Transforming Indonesia's climate change response: a multi-stakeholder approach for Aceh", which is meant to be implemented in a complementary way with the Technical Assistance services described in these TOR and which has been ongoing in Aceh since early 2013.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Final
Coverage	As defined in section 1.2
Geographic scope	The action is primarily implemented in Aceh, Indonesia. Activities in Jakarta are also foreseen and some linked activities in other provinces may also be carried out
Period to be evaluated	The entire period of the Action to date.

2.1 Objectives of the evaluation

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority⁷ of the European Commission⁸. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and

⁶ Accountability and Local Level Initiative to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in Indonesia, a project implemented by ICRAF (the International Centre for Research in Agro-forestry) in Papua and four other provinces.

⁷COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" -http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

⁸ SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf; SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf; COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf

the **results**⁹ of Actions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy within increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.¹⁰

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** between: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union, the interested stakeholders and the wider public with:

- an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the SICCR-TAC, paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future Actions.

In particular, this evaluation will serve as means to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, achievements, results, impacts, sustainability and visibility.

The main users of this evaluation will be the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of Support to Indonesia's Climate Change Response Technical Assistance Component" Project

2.2 Requested services

2.2.1 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and 'early signs of', impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in the sector and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Action, its governance and monitoring.

⁹ Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/finacial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf.

¹⁰ The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

2.2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager¹¹ and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

Assess the relevance of the programmes:

- To assess to what extent the objectives of SICCR-TAC programmes are consistent with the Government of Indonesia priorities, strategies and plans as well as the EU policies.
- To what extent the project has and will achieve its intended objective (partially or fully) within the given timeframe and weigh on its ability to contribute to the provincial and national efforts on climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- To assess the level of flexibility and adaptively of the project to meets the demand and the objectives of the provincial and national government related to climate change and greening the development objective (demand driven approach).
- To evaluate the level of satisfactory of the project beneficiaries on project interventions both at strategic level and at field level

Assess the efficiency of the programmes:

- To assess how well inputs and resources have been turned into results, in terms of quality, quantity and timing.
- To review the appropriateness of implementation modalities, specifically the demand driven nature of the programme and the level of involvement of education stakeholders in the Actions.
- To assess the extent to which outputs and/or the desired effects are achieved with the lowest possible use of resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.).

Assess the effectiveness of the programmes:

- To assess overall progress and results achieved by the Action.
- To assess whether the Action achieved its specific objectives and intended results.

Assess the impact of the programmes

- To assess early positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the actions, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

Assess the sustainability of the programmes

- To assess how the results and benefits will be maintained after the action ended.
- To provide recommendation if any follow-up action is required in view of Aceh Province as one of the strategic location due to its extensive forest cover, but also taking into account that Indonesia has now graduated for the recipient county of EU Bilateral funding .

¹¹ The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

Assess the EU added value:

To what extent the fact that the action has been financed through the EU has had added benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' and other donors interventions only?

Assess the coherence/ complementarity with EU policies, ASEAN policies and with other donors interventions.

- Assess the coherence/ complementarity with EU policies, MOEF policies and with other donors interventions. .

2.3 Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases

- Inception
- Desk
- Field
- Synthesis

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

2.3.1 Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 5.

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
<u>Inception Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial document/data collection• Background analysis• Inception interviews*• Stakeholder analysis• Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews)• Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis)and evaluation matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• *Kick-off meeting (phone call) with the Contracting Authority• Inception Note
<u>Desk Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)• Identification of information gaps and	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Desk Note

Phases of the evaluation	Key activities	Outputs and meetings
	of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodological design of the Field Phase 	
<u>Field Phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gathering of primary evidence with the use ‘the most appropriate techniques’ Data collection and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kick-off meeting with EU Delegation Indonesia <i>Initial meetings at country level with Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF)/ DG Climate Change (DGCC) & Aceh Forestry Service</i> Interviews with SICCR-TAC project staff and beneficiaries via face-to-face or phone meeting Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase <i>Debriefing with the EU Delegation Indonesia</i>
<u>Synthesis phase</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions) Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Final Report Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module Final Report Slide presentation <i>Meeting with Reference Group (Project Steering Committee) / Final Workshop in the EU Delegation or in premises of MOEF</i>

2.3.2 Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study to be conducted by the evaluations from home. It will then continue with an initial teleconference between EU Delegation Indonesia and the evaluators.

The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to Indonesia / climate change, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Action that describes how change is expected to happen within the Action, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the

assumptions that must hold for the Action to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix¹², which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality.**

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Note. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an Inception Note; its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.3 Desk Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Action.

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

At the end of the desk phase a **Desk Note** and a **Slide Presentation** will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5

2.3.4 Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Desk Note by the Evaluation Manager.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements

¹² *The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions,*

are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with EU Delegation Indonesia, followed with interviews with Project Team and DGCC of MoEF.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government and local authorities in Aceh Province and agencies (i.e. Aceh Forest Services, Planning Agency another relevant agencies). Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the EU Delegation (**face-to-face feedback**).

At the end of the Field Phase a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described in Chapter 5.

2.3.5 Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

- Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
- When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
- The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Jakarta, Indonesia, the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group (Project Steering Committee) to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. Half day of presence is required

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG(through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

2.4 Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited Framework Contractors will submit their specific Contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in the Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference and notably gender equality and the empowerment of women. This will include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

2.5 Management and Steering of the evaluation

2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EU Delegation Indonesia; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of EU , i.e. Climate Change Counsellor and Ministry of Environment and Forestry and Aceh Forestry Services. .

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- To define and validate the Evaluation Questions.
- To facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders.
- To ensure that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- To discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team.
- To assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation.
- To support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the Requirements set in the art. 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of: the process; the evaluation design; the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- Support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood.
- Provide backstopping and quality control of the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment.
- Ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

2.6 Language of the Specific contract

The language of the specific contract is to be English

3 EXPERTISE REQUIRED

3.1 Number of experts and of working days per category

The table below indicates the minimum number of evaluators and the minimum number of working days (overall and in the field), per category of experts to be foreseen by the Contractor.

Category of experts	Minimum number of evaluators	Total minimum number of working days (total)	(Out of which) minimum number of working days on mission
Cat I	1	22	12

In particular, the Team Leader (to be identified in the Organisation and Methodology and in the Financial Offer) is expected to be a Cat I expert, possess a demonstrable senior evaluation expertise coherent with the requirements of this assignment and not provide less than 22 working days, out of which 12 in the field.

3.2 Expertise required

Minimum requirements of the team

Category I Expert – Natural Resource Management Specialist / Team Leader

- Education at least Master Degree Academic level in economic, environmental sciences, ecology or related discipline, or equivalent professional experience of at least 15 years in the sector Natural Resource Management, Forestry, Agroforestry Ecosystem Services and Spatial Plan.
- General professional experience: At least 12 years of experience skills in Natural Resource Management, Forestry, Agroforestry Ecosystem Services and Spatial Plan.
- Knowledge on **Strategic Evaluation** of Natural Resource Management, Greening the Development Plan and Climate Change Mitigation Programmes would be an asset (with 3 similar assignments conducted before as minimum).
- Knowledge and understanding on Frameworks for Natural Resource Management and Environmental Governance and its operational structure (i.e. vertical and horizontal) would be an asset.
- Familiarity with sustainable and eco-friendly income generating activities (i.e. agroforestry, non-timber forest products, payment for ecosystem services) and / or experience with projects on environment and climate change impacts. 1 (one) assignment related to the abovementioned is the minimum.
- Knowledge on sustainable management of Land Use and land Use Changes (in the context of increasing carbon stock) in tropical forest with focus on mineral soil and peat soil. 2 (two) assignments related to the abovementioned is the minimum.

Language skills of the evaluator:

- English: possess C2 level expertise (writing, speaking, understanding)

Languages levels are defined for understanding, speaking and writing skills by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages available at:

<https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr> and shall be demonstrated by certificates or by past relevant experience.

The European Union pursues an equal opportunities policy. Gender balance in the proposed team, at all levels, is highly recommended.

3.3 Presence of management team for briefing and/or debriefing

The presence of member(s) of the management team is not required for briefing or debriefing purposes.

4 LOCATION AND DURATION

4.1 Starting period

Provisional start of the assignment is beginning of January 2019

4.2 Foreseen duration of the assignment in calendar days

Maximum duration of the assignment: 50 calendar days.

This overall duration includes working days, week-ends, periods foreseen for comments, for review of draft versions, debriefing sessions, and distribution of outputs.

The Draft report will have to be delivered and then presented to the EUD and Beneficiaries in the premises of MoEF, Jakarta, Indonesia the latest by 29/01/2019

4.3 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff¹³

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex IV. The 'Indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks, or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national / local or other stakeholders.

4.4 Location(s) of assignment

The assignment will take place in Jakarta, and in Aceh Province.

5 REPORTING

5.1 Content, timing and submission

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of Action is required (to be attached as Annex).

List of outputs:

¹³ As per art 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

	Number of Pages (excluding annexes)	Main Content	Timing for submission
Inception-Note	8 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention logic • Stakeholder map • Methodology for the evaluation, incl.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods ○ Consultation strategy ○ Field visit approach • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures • Work plan 	End of Desk Phase
Desk Note	5 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary answers to each Evaluation Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information • Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered and hypotheses to be tested during the field visit 	End of the Desk Phase
Draft Final Report	40 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Draft Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cf. detailed structure in Annex III</u> 	End of Synthesis Phase
Final report	40 pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as of the Draft Final Report, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	One week after having received comments to the Draft Final Report.
Executive Summary – by using the EVAL online template	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same specifications as for the Draft Executive Summary, incorporating any comments received from the concerned parties on the draft report that have been accepted 	Together with the final version of the Final Report

5.2 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

It is strongly recommended that the **submission of deliverables** by the selected contractor **be performed through their uploading in the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related Specific contract validity.

5.3 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send to the Contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments shall be submitted within 7 calendar days from the date of receipt of the

comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

5.4 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex V). The Contractor is given – through the EVAL module - the possibility to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager. The QAG will then be reviewed following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation by the Evaluation Manager of the FWC SIEA's Specific Contract Performance Evaluation.

5.5 Language

All reports shall be submitted in English.

5.6 Number of report copies

Apart from their submission -preferably via the EVALModule-, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 5paper copies and in electronic version in PDF version at no extra cost.

5.7 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Request for Services n° 2018/401003

FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 1 Sustainable management of Natural Resources and resilience

EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi

1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Contracting Authority selects the offer with the best value for money using an 80/20 weighting between technical quality and price¹⁴.

Technical quality is evaluated on the basis of the following grid:

Criteria	Maximum
Total score for Organisation and Methodology	50
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Understanding of ToR and the aim of the services to be provided	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, appropriate mix of tools and estimate of difficulties and challenges	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Technical added value, backstopping and role of the involved members of the consortium	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Organisation of tasks including timetable	10
Score for the expertise of the proposed team	50
OVERALL TOTAL SCORE	100

2. TECHNICAL THRESHOLD

Any offer falling short of the technical threshold of 75 out of 100 points, is automatically rejected.

3. INTERVIEWS DURING THE EVALUATION OF THE OFFERS

No interviews are foreseen during the evaluation of offers.

4.

¹⁴ For more details about the 80/20 rule, please see the PRAG, chapter 3.3.10.5 - https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/funding/about-funding-and-procedures/procedures-and-practical-guide-prag_en

ANNEX II: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

- Legal texts and political commitments pertaining to the Action(s) to be evaluated
- Country Strategy Paper and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered
- Relevant national / sector policies and plans from National and Local partners and other donors
- Action identification studies
- Action feasibility / formulation studies
- Action financing agreement and addenda
- Action's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports
- European Commission's Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Reports, and other external and internal monitoring reports of the Action
- Action's mid-term evaluation report and other relevant evaluations, audit, reports
- Relevant documentation from National/Local partners and other donors
- Guidance for Gender sensitive evaluations
- Calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the Action(s)
- Any other relevant document

Note: The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the Action.

ANNEX III: STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The contractor will deliver – **preferably through their uploading in the EVAL Module- two distinct documents**: the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary**. They must be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation – if foreseen.

The Final Report should not be longer than the number of pages indicated in Chapter 6. Additional information on the overall context of the Action, description of methodology and analysis of findings should be reported in an Annex to the main text.

The presentation must be properly spaced and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report shall carry the following text:

“This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission”.

Executive Summary

A short, tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons to be learned and specific recommendations. It is to be prepared by using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module.

The main sections of the evaluation report shall be as follows:

1. Introduction

A description of the Action, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.

2. Answered questions/ Findings

A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Questions, supported by evidence and reasoning.

3. Overall assessment (optional)

A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the Action. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.3 Lessons learnt

Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.

4.1 Conclusions

This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasizing the 3 or 4 major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

4.2 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the Action in the framework of the cycle under way, or to prepare the design of a new Action for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
- The names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
- Detailed evaluation methodology including: options taken, difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses.
- Evaluation Matrix
- Intervention logic / Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated)
- Relevant geographic map(s) where the Action took place
- List of persons/organisations consulted
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant
- Detailed answer to the Evaluation Questions, judgement criteria and indicators

ANNEX IV: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by Framework Contractors in their Specific Contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it. Framework Contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation shall reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days ¹⁵		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator ...	Indicative Dates
Inception phase: total days				
•				
•				
Desk phase: total days				
•				
•				
Field phase: total days				
•				
•				
Synthesis phase: total days				
•				
•				
Dissemination phase: total days				
•				
•				
TOTAL working days (maximum)				

¹⁵Add one column per each evaluator

ANNEX V: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (since the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included in the **EVAlModule**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, which will have the possibility to include their comments.

Action (Project/Programme) evaluation –Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
CRIS ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAl ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:		End:
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

The evaluation report is assessed as follows

1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- Are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers
- Highlight the key messages
- The length of the various chapters and annexes of the Report are well balanced
- Contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding
- Contain a list of acronyms (only the Report)
- Avoid unnecessary duplications
- Have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology
- The report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations
- The report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Findings derive from the evidence gathered
- Findings address all selected evaluation criteria
- Findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources



- When assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts
- The analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors

Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

4. Validity of conclusions

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- Conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis
- Conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the evaluation questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions
- Conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation
- Conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations
- (If relevant) whether the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

5. Usefulness of recommendations

This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations:

- Are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions
- Are concrete, achievable and realistic
- Are targeted to specific addressees
- Are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound
- (If relevant) provide advice for the Action's exit strategy, post-Action sustainability or for adjusting Action's design or plans



Strengths	Weaknesses	Score
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)

This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which:



- Lessons are identified
- When relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments
Final comments on the overall quality of the report	Overall score

ANNEX VI: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED ACTION(S)

Table 1: Logframe – Updated intervention logic

Revised SICCR-TAC Log frame				
Project Title: Support to Indonesia's Climate Change Response (SICCR) – Technical Assistance Component		Project Number:		Project Country: Indonesia
Planning Period: 1.07.2016-31.12.2016		Prepared on: 15.06.2016		EC Consultant: GIZ in cooperation with SNV and AHT
Project Purpose: Aceh province contributes in an effective and coherent way to the national and provincial REDD+ strategy through enhanced forest governance and by implementing and monitoring sustainable, participatory, transparent, low-carbon and economically sound land-use decisions				
Overall Objective	Logic intervention	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources and means of Verification	Assumptions
	Indonesia achieves its climate change response objectives in the Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry sector through low carbon development, resource efficiency and optimal development planning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual figures on National Green House Gas (GHG) emissions Annual deforestation and land conversion / degradation rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National reports such as National Communications to UNFCCC Provincial Government reports and publications Independent reports on Indonesia GHG emissions and deforestation / land degradation rate, using satellite data and ground monitoring information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued commitment to low-carbon development at the central level and in the targeted province.
Project Purpose	Logic intervention	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources and means of Verification	Assumptions
	Aceh province contributes in an effective and coherent way to the national REDD+ strategy, by streamlining provincial REDD+ strategies with existing development planning frameworks and by implementing and monitoring sustainable, participatory, transparent, low-carbon and economically sound land-use decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress towards applicable sub-national objectives of the REDD+ national and provincial strategy in Aceh. Pressure on Aceh's forest resources is reduced through an increase in the productivity of existing plantations and the direction of future expansion onto already degraded areas Aceh provides employment and livelihoods through land optimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial government progress reports on Aceh REDD+ strategy, and other relevant provincial initiatives in the LULUCF sector. Progress reports from the central government (DJPP and other bodies) on the implementation of the REDD+ Strategy Independent reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible changes in the political context will not weaken current low-carbon development commitments in Aceh The international REDD+ framework and the development of climate change finance mechanisms provide incentives to the implementation of REDD+ actions in Indonesia Efforts to establish a national MRV framework, including clear institutional mechanisms, are continued Continued progress is made to improve the investment climate in Indonesia Awareness on alternative economic trajectories which could be identified by a green economy approach improves among district authorities and the private sector
Results	Logic intervention	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources and means of Verification	Assumptions
	Result 1: Consensus and capacities of stakeholders to implement integrated low carbon development in Aceh is enhanced and FMUs are strengthened to support the implementation of local initiatives that contribute to the provincial and national REDD+ strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincial and district spatial plans, economic plans, and medium and long term development plans are implemented in line with the SRAP, RAN-GRK, national REDD+ strategy, the FLEGT VPA and SVLK initiatives and other relevant climate change response policies in a participatory and integrated manner. Four FMUs are well functioning and connect and contribute to the national climate change strategies and coordinate effectively with districts to promote low carbon development and participatory land use planning and development at the village level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official documents from Provincial and District Governments in Aceh Reports from civil society and the media in Aceh Reports of FMUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political stability is maintained in Aceh Efforts to improve governance in Aceh are continued.
	Result 2: Provincial forest ecological assets monitoring and monitoring of other asset attributes such tenure and forest governance, are in place in Aceh and information gathered is used to promote benefit sharing, participatory land-use planning and evidence based decision making. These systems are in line with the national MRV framework, which is developed, based on experiences from relevant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangements for monitoring forest and land use governance, transparency and participation in Aceh are functioning, Institutional arrangements for MRV in Aceh are functioning Clear reporting and coordination mechanisms with the national authorities responsible for forest and land use monitoring are established Baseline data are consolidated and information on emissions, deforestation rates, land tenure, and economic, social and environmental impact of SVLK is collected and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor decrees and/or other Provincial regulations Annual central and provincial government reports on GHG emissions and changes to ecosystem attributes Independent reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A national MRV framework, including clear institutional mechanisms, is effectively established.

	initiatives such as FLEGT/SVLK including provision for independent monitoring.	<p>reported on a yearly basis in a credible way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information collected through participatory mapping is available and feeds into spatial planning decisions, a review of forest communities' legal status is provided and progress on the implementation of FMUs is reported. 		
	Result 3: Result 3 : New investments and economic development initiatives, in the forestry and plantation sectors, are compatible with low-carbon, resource efficiency, biodiversity and livelihoods concerns, and with the provincial and national REDD+ strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area, type and volume of enhanced land use or land use change (timber, coffee, cacao and other crops/community, SME, industrial) of new logging and plantation developments in the four FMUs of Aceh. Geographical location of new plantations and agroforestry systems, user rights, projected incomes and benefit sharing in each area Number of land tenure conflict reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official government reports on provincial investments and sector development in Aceh Government / independent maps of deforestation, plantations development, degraded lands allocation Agreements forged between producers and buyers Agreements on tenure/user rights on areas developed Civil society and media reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aceh provincial strategies and plans are economically relevant Continued progress is made to improve the investment climate in Indonesia Awareness on green economy improves among district authorities and the private sector.

Activities		Means	Costs	Assumptions / Risks
1	Build consensus, develop and strengthen capacities and relevant institutional frameworks. Institutional capacities are developed to support the implementation of local initiatives that contribute to the national REDD+ strategy.			
1.1	Build consensus and support coordination, outreach and dialogue in Aceh and maintain dialogue with authorities and stakeholders at central level.			
1.1.1	Identify key stakeholders and analyse institutional frameworks, strategies, policies and regional development priorities			
1.1.2	Maintain dialogue with provincial and central stakeholders			
1.1.3	Develop information campaign and encourage relevant institutions to raise awareness, disseminate information on new policies, regulations and results of the studies			
1.1.4	Cooperate with relevant development projects for information exchange			
1.2	Develop capacities for implementation of climate change strategies and low carbon planning			
1.2.1	Asses capacity of government and other actors in Aceh and develop strategies for capacity development			
1.2.2	Strengthen capacity of government and other actors in Aceh Forestry Service and FMUs, BAPPEDA, BAPEDAL etc.			
1.2.3	Asses and strengthen capacity of the DGCC including its Regional Office in Sumatra			
1.2.4	Strengthen local policy framework for REDD+ and FMUs			
1.3	Support participatory land use planning and spatial planning at landscape scale			
1.3.1	Strengthen participatory land use planning			
2	Support monitoring of provincial forest ecological assets and other asset attributes such as tenure and forest governance. The MRV system in Aceh will comply with the framework developed at the national level, promote benefit sharing, participatory land-use planning and evidence based decision making. The MRV system will also provide lessons to support initiatives such as FLEGT /SVLK as well as recommendations for independent monitoring.			
2.1	Commission studies to compile existing data, produce harmonized maps and to gather new information aimed at informing sound provincial land-use planning and identification of new investment opportunities.			
2.1.1	Identify data and information gaps	Key experts: Key Expert 1 Team Leader: 660 m/d	€4,298,000 fees	
2.1.2	Establish local knowledge partnerships			
2.1.3	Conduct studies in collaboration with the relevant project stakeholders	Key Expert 2 Strategic Coordination Expert 650 m/d	€2,000,000 incidental expenditure	
2.1.4	Assess existing fiscal incentive mechanisms			
2.2	Develop knowledge management instruments and referencing tools to maximise the availability of knowledge relevant to low-carbon development and climate change adaptation			
2.2.1	Support development of knowledge management tools to promote local wisdom in climate change adaptation			
2.2.2	Develop up-to-date knowledge management products and tools to disseminate information at national, provincial and district levels			
2.3	Support development of provincial and district level MRV and provide guidance for national REDD+ MRV guidelines			
2.3.1	Provide technical assistance to establish provincial and district level MRV	Non-Key experts (total of 3500 m/d): Senior Non-Key Expert – 2300 m/d	€200,000 expenditure verification	
2.3.2	Support implementation of MRV capacity development program, networking and exchange	Junior Non-Key Expert 1200 m/d		
3	Advice to new investments and economic development initiatives in particular in the forestry and plantation sectors, are compatible with low-carbon, biodiversity and livelihoods concerns, relevant provincial initiatives as well as with the national REDD+ strategy. The initiatives will also be structured around a defined participatory consultative mechanism.			
3.1	Engage relevant actors to invest and develop viable economic activities connected to enhanced land use, sustainable land management and forest conservation.			
3.1.1	Disseminate information on potential areas for development and engage stakeholders in dialogue to foster partnerships.			
3.1.2	Support demonstration activities in social forestry, agroforestry, NTFP certification, community empowerment etc.			
3.1.3	Test locally relevant financial incentive mechanisms (prioritised in the activity 2.1.4), asses suitability and systematize and share lessons learnt, promote up scaling			
3.2	Develop capacities for locally relevant green economic development in the field of certification, best management practices, market access, sustainability and improved use of technology.			
3.2.1	Support trainings and assistance in the field of certification, best management practices, sustainability and improved use of technology in collaboration with the relevant institutions based on identified needs and provincial priorities			
Overall Project Management				
Preparation and participation in regular Management Meetings				
Preparation and participation in regular Steering Committee Meetings				
Development of M&E&L Concept and implementation of regular M&E and learning				
Preparation and implementation of Communication and Visibility Strategy (web-site/inputs to partner web-sites, proceedings of regular project sharing workshops etc.)				
Closing Phase				
Project Closure (Accounts, equipment, office etc.)				

Activities	Means	Costs	Assumptions / Risks
Dissemination activities			
Handing over of all materials, documents etc.			
Reporting			
Inception Report			