# Midterm Review Terms of Reference

**Standard Template 2: Formatted information to be entered in UNDP Jobs website**[1]

## BASIC CONTRACT INFORMATION

**Location: Indonesia**
**Application Deadline: 23:59 PM GMT +7 on 15 October 2020**
**Type of Contract:** Individual Contract
**Post Level: National Consultant**
**Languages Required: English, fluency in Bahasa Indonesia**
**Starting Date: October 2020**
**Duration of Initial Contract: 35 working days**
**Expected Duration of Assignment: October 2020 – December 2020**

## BACKGROUND

### A. Project Title

**Combatting illegal and unsustainable trade in endangered species in Indonesia**

### B. Project Description

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for -the Midterm Review (MTR) of the full-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed project titled Combatting illegal and unsustainable trade in endangered species in Indonesia (PIMS-5391) implemented through the Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry Ministry of Environment and Forestry which is to be undertaken in 7 year. The project started in November 2017 and is in its third year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

The project seeks to address the devastating impact of unsustainable and illegal wildlife trade (IWT) on wildlife populations in Indonesia and SE Asia. The value of the illegal trade in Indonesia alone is estimated at up to US$ 1 billion per year. Factoring in the unsustainable legal trade, the value rockets, representing an enormous economic, environmental, and social loss. This trade has already caused the decline and local extinction of many species across SE Asia. Much of the trade is highly organized, benefits a relatively small criminal fraternity, whilst depriving developing economies of billions of dollars in lost revenues and development opportunities. Within SE Asia, a significant amount of this trade starts from Indonesia, one of the world's top 10 'megadiverse' countries and the largest supplier of wildlife products in Asia, both 'legal' and illegal. The IWT and associated bushmeat trade are an immediate threat to the existence of key endangered species such as the Sumatran and

[1] https://jobs.undp.org/

Javan Rhinoceros, Sumatran Tiger, Asian Elephant and Sunda Pangolin amongst a wide range of less prominent species. Indonesia is also becoming an important transit point for IWT from Africa to East Asia, such as African Ivory. The consequence of the unsustainable trade is a massive
threat to globally important wildlife.

The project aims to remove the barriers to accomplishing the long term solution to this challenge, namely to conserve key wildlife species in Indonesia, by ensuring that the legal wildlife trade is ecologically and economically sustainable, while reducing the scale and impact of illegal wildlife trafficking, both from Indonesia and in transit through the country.

The Project Objective is to reduce the volume of unsustainable wildlife trade and the rate of loss of globally significant biodiversity in Indonesia and East and South-East Asia. The four outcomes of the project are:

**Outcome 1**: Strengthened national policy, legal and institutional framework for regulating legal commercial wildlife trade and combating illegal wildlife trade.
**Outcome 2**: Strengthened institutional capacity for regulatory coordination, implementation and enforcement at the national and international levels.
**Outcome 3**: Improved enforcement strategy demonstrated and scaled up at key trade ports and connected subnational regions with key ecosystems.
**Outcome 4**: Implementation and upscaling/replication of project approaches at national and international levels is supported by effective knowledge management and gender mainstreaming.

This project is part of the GEF Programmatic Approach to Prevent the Extinction of Known Threatened Species, and falls under the GEF Programme Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention For Sustainable Development which is led by the World Bank.

The total allocated resources for this project is US $ USD 6,988,853. In addition, in-kind Parallel Funding is US $ 51,937,595 from the Government of Indonesia and NGO partners. Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry is the Implementing Partner for the project.

As of 30 August 2020, there were 172,053 confirmed cases of Covid-19 in Indonesia, of which 7,343 were fatalities and 124,185 persons recovered. Covid-19 has spread in 34 provinces and 487 regencies/cities across Indonesia. Some regions implemented large social restrictions to prevent Covid-19 pandemics. Covid-19 pandemics have affected the implementation of the project. Based on the assessment, some works can continue on-schedule, while some are deferred and likely to delay and some may need readjustment to adapt to the new normal.

## C. MTR Purpose

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The MTR will also look at any project interventions that have contributed directly or indirectly to government's effort of COVID-19 recovery both at the national level and project sites.

## Duties and Responsibilities

Detailed tasks of a national consultant as follows:

1. Provide input into the Inception Report to be drafted by the IC (International Consultant). In particular, the NC should:
    a. Consult with the PMU to develop the draft project site visit itinerary, taking into consideration guidelines on-site visits and stakeholder consultations provided by the International Consultant/Team Leader (IC)
    b. Prepare an evaluation question matrix to be used in conjunction with that prepared by the IC and focused specifically on those consultations that will take place during field visits.
2. Maintain the up-to-date actual itinerary of the Evaluation Team (ET) for all in-country meetings conducted
3. Maintain an up-to-date comprehensive list of persons met by the ET (all meetings, including those held by zoom, skype, or otherwise virtually)
4. Prepare a list of all products/outputs (technical reports, land use or management plans, curricula, etc.) produced with project financial support
5. Review products as indicated by the IC & provide product assessment using the format provided by the IC
6. Prepare a list of all training conducted with project financial support
7. At outset of assignment, brief IC on updated institutional/policy/legislative frameworks relevant to the project and on key relevant in-country initiatives (national and state government programs/campaigns), NGO activities, and donor-supported projects)
8. Undertake in-country consultations
9. Summarize each consultation undertaken ensuring that important data is recorded that allows for detailed, evidence-based observations and conclusions to be drawn.
10. Engage with IC in review and analysis of important information gained during the day's meetings during regularly scheduled twice weekly zoom or skype calls
11. Engage with IC in the analysis of evaluation findings
12. Participate as requested by the IC in the preliminary presentation of evaluation findings
13. Take photos of site visits for inclusion in the evaluation report
14. Fill in information gaps as needed following the drafting of the Evaluation report by IC

# D. MTR Approach & Methodology

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

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

The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[2] ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.

[2] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry Ministry of Environment and Forestry; National Project Director (NPD) CIWT Project; Directorate of Forest Protection Ministry of Environment and Forestry; Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation Ministry of Environment and Forestry; GEF Operational Focal Point of Indonesia; Head of BBKSDA North Sumatera, Head of BBKSDA Riau; Head of Balai Gakkum Sumatera; Head of Balai Gakkum Sulawesi; Head of Gunung Leuser National Park; Head of BKSDA North Sumatera, Head of Bogani Nanti Wartabone National Park; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team may require conducting field missions to Surabaya, East Java; Pekanbaru, Riau; Kotamobagu, North Sulawesi; Manado, North Sulawesi.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since 03/2020 and travel in the country is also restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR mission then the MTR team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the MTR virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the MTR schedule. This should be detailed in the MTR Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit

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

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

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

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. Considering the COVID-19 situation, the MTR team should consider flexibility in using technologies and tools to effectively engage stakeholder virtually. The MTR team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the MTR report.

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

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

## E. Detailed Scope of the MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for extended descriptions.

### 1. Project Strategy

Project Design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
    - Were relevant gender issues (e.g. the impact of the project on gender equality in the programme country, involvement of women's groups, engaging women in project activities) raised in the Project Document?

Results Framework/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

### 2. Progress Towards Results

- Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; populate the Progress Towards Results Matrix, as described in the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for the project objective and each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "not on target to be achieved" (red).
- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool/Core Indicators at the Baseline with the one completed right before the Midterm Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Do the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and/or UNDP and other partners have the capacity to deliver benefits to or involve women? If yes, how?
- What is the gender balance of project staff? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in project staff?
- What is the gender balance of the Project Board? What steps have been taken to ensure gender balance in the Project Board?

Work Planning

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financer | Type of Co-financing | Co-financing amount confirmed at CEO Endorsement (US$) | Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US$) | Actual % of Expected Amount |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UNDP | | In-kind | 100,000 | | |
| Government | DG-Law Enforcement, MoEF | In-kind | 42,848,742 | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NGO | Wildlife Conservation Society | In-Kind | 2,000,000 | | |
| | | **TOTAL** | 44,948,742 | | |

- Include the separate GEF Co-Financing template (filled out by the Commissioning Unit and project team) which categorizes co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditures'. (This template will be annexed as a separate file.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were incorporated in monitoring systems. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.

Stakeholder Engagement

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
- How does the project engage women and girls? Is the project likely to have the same positive and/or negative effects on women and men, girls and boys? Identify, if possible, legal, cultural, or religious constraints on women's participation in the project. What can the project do to enhance its gender benefits?

Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

- Validate the risks identified in the project's most current SESP, and those risks' ratings; are any revisions needed?
- Summarize and assess the revisions made since CEO Endorsement/Approval (if any) to:
  - The project's overall safeguards risk categorization.
  - The identified types of risks[3] (in the SESP).
  - The individual risk ratings (in the SESP) .
- Describe and assess progress made in the implementation of the project's social and environmental management measures as outlined in the SESP submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval (and prepared during implementation, if any), including any revisions to those measures. Such management

[3] Risks are to be labeled with both the UNDP SES Principles and Standards, and the GEF's "types of risks and potential impacts": Climate Change and Disaster; Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups; Disability Inclusion; Adverse Gender-Related impact, including Gender-based Violence and Sexual Exploitation; Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources; Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Cultural Heritage; Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention; Labor and Working Conditions; Community Health, Safety and Security.

measures might include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) or other management plans, though can also include aspects of a project's design; refer to Question 6 in the SESP template for a summary of the identified management measures.

A given project should be assessed against the version of UNDP's safeguards policy that was in effect at the time of the project's approval.

Reporting

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project oard.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications & Knowledge Management

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.
- List knowledge activities/products developed (based on knowledge management approach approved at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

## 4. Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Register are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to

appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR consultant/team will include a section in the MTR report for evidence-based **conclusions**, in light of the findings.

Additionally, the MTR consultant/team is expected to make **recommendations** to the Project Team. Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. The MTR consultant/team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

**Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See the TOR Annexes for the Rating Table and ratings scales.

## F. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The MTR team shall prepare and submit:

- MTR Inception Report: MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of the Midterm Review no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit and project management. Completion date: October 2020
- Presentation: MTR team presents initial findings to project management and the Commissioning Unit at the end of the MTR mission. Completion date: November 2020
- Draft MTR Report: MTR team submits the draft full report with annexes within 3 weeks of the MTR mission. Completion date: November 2020
- Final Report*: MTR team submits the revised report with annexed and completed Audit Trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report. To be sent to the Commissioning Unit within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. Completion date: December 2020

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

## G. Institutional Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Indonesia Country Office.

The Commissioning Unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team and will provide an updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email). The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

## H. Duration of the Work

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 35 of days over a period of 5 weeks starting 08 October 2020 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant(s) are hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

- 15 October 2020*:* Application closes
- October 2020*:* Selection of MTR Team
- October 2020*:* Prep the MTR Team (handover of project documents)
- October 2020, 02 days *(r: 2-4):* Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report
- October, 03 days*:* Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception Report- latest start of MTR mission
- October – November 2020 14 days *(r: 7-15):* MTR mission: online stakeholder meetings, online interviews
- November 2020*:* Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission
- November 2020) 05 days *(r: 5-10):* Preparing draft report
- November 2020 01 day *(r: 1-2):* Incorporating audit trail on draft report/Finalization of MTR report
- November 2020*:* Preparation & Issue of Management Response
- December 2020*):* (optional) Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (not mandatory for MTR team)
- December 2020*:* Expected date of full MTR completion

The date start of contract is … October 2020.

## I. Duty Station

a) The contractor's duty station will be home-based with possibility of travel to Jakarta, Aceh Province, Riau Province, East Java Province and North Sulawesi Province during field visit to project sites, subject to the approval from RR or The Head of Unit.
b) The consultant is working on the output-based, thus no necessity to report or present regularly

**Travel:**

- Domestic travel will be required to project sites during the MTR mission, consider if it is safe to operate and travel;
- The BSAFE training course must be successfully completed prior to commencement of travel; Herewith is the link to access this training: https://training.dss.un.org/courses/login/index.php . These training modules at this secure internet site is accessible to Consultants, which allows for registration with private email.
- Individual Consultants are responsible for ensuring they have vaccinations/inoculations when travelling to certain countries, as designated by the UN Medical Director.
- Consultants are required to comply with the UN security directives set forth under https://dss.un.org/dssweb/

- All related travel expenses will be covered and will be reimbursed as per UNDP rules and regulations upon submission of an F-10 claim form and supporting documents (travel expense facilitated by CIWT project).

| No | Indicative Location | Frequency | Number of Travel Days |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Aceh** | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | **Riau** | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | **East Java** | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | **North Sulawesi** | 1 | 4 |

## REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

## J. Qualifications of the Successful Applicants

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one International Consultant as team leader and one National Consultant as technical expert. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design and writing of the MTR report. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in developing the MTR itinerary. The National Consultant will also act as a focal point for coordinating and working with relevant stakeholders in Indonesia. If the international travel restriction continues and, in-country mission is not possible, the MTR team will use alternative means of interviewing stakeholders and data collection (i.e. Skype interview, mobile questionnaires, etc.) including the field visit by the National Consultant under the International Consultant's guidance

The consultants cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

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

When using this weighted scoringmethod, the award of the contract should be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and

b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

* Technical Criteria weight; 70%

* Financial Criteria weight; 30%

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 point would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

| Criteria | Weight | Maximum Point |
|---|---|---|
| *Technical Criteria* | | |
| **Criteria A: qualification requirements as per ToR:** | **40%** | 10 |
| Master's degree in forestry, biodiversity studies, wildlife management and other biodiversity related fields. Experience in illegal wildlife trade is an advantage or other closely related field | | 10 |
| At least five (5) years' experience with result-based management and evaluation methodologies particularly in the area of sustainable development and/or biodiversity/illegal wildlife trade with gender sensitive analysis | | 10 |
| Experience working with the UN and/or GEF or GEF-evaluations | | 10 |
| **Criteria B: Brief Description of Approach to Assignment** | **60%** | |
| Understands the task and applies a methodology appropriate for the task? | | 25 |
| Important aspects of the task addressed clearly and in sufficient detail? | | 20 |
| Is planning logical, realistic for efficient project implementation? | | 15 |

Education

A Master's degree in forestry, biodiversity studies, wildlife management or other closely related field.

Experience

- Master with more 5 years of professional experience in forestry management, biodiversity, wildlife management and others related field.
- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Illegal Wildlife Trade/Biodiversity;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least 5 years;
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to Illegal Wildlife Trade/Biodiversity;; experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis.
- Excellent communication skills;
- Good network with related government and stakeholders

- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.
- Fluency in Bahasa Indonesia

## K. Ethics

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

## L. Schedule of Payments

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

  Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%
  - The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
  - The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
  - The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

# APPLICATION PROCESS

## M. Recommended Presentation of Offer

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[4] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[5]);

[4] https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx
[5] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address UNDP Indonesia Procurement Unit Menara Thamrin 7-9th Floor Jl. MH Thamrin Kav. 3 Jakarta 10250 in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Combatting illegal and unsustainable trade in endangered species in Indonesia Midterm Review" or by email at the following address ONLY: (bids.id@undp.org) by **(23:59 PM GMT +7 on 28 September 2020).** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

## N. Criteria for Selection of the Best Offer

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

## O. Annexes to the MTR ToR

Annexes include: (reference ToR Annexes in Annex 3 of *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*)

- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings Table and Ratings Scales
- MTR Report Clearance Form
- Audit Trail Template
- Progress Towards Results Matrix
- GEF Co-Financing Template (in Word)

# Annexes to Midterm Review Terms of Reference

## For Standard Template 2

- **ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team**
- **ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[6]
- **ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template**
- **ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants**[7]
- **ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table and Rating Scales**
- **ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**
- **ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**
- **ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix**
- **ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)**

### ToR ANNEX A: List of Documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team

*(The Commissioning Unit is responsible for compiling these documents prior to the recruitment of the MTR team so that they are available to the team immediately after contract signature.)*

1. PIF
2. UNDP Initiation Plan
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP)
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
7. Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools/Core Indicators at CEO endorsement and midterm review
10. Oversight mission reports
11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

13. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
14. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
15. Minutes of the Combatting illegal and unsustainable trade in endangered species in Indonesia Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)

---

[6] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

[7] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

16. Project site location maps

## ToR ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report[8]

**i.** Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP PIMS# and GEF project ID#
- MTR time frame and date of MTR report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program
- Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
- MTR team members
- Acknowledgements

**ii.** Table of Contents

**iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations

**1.** Executive Summary *(3-5 pages)*
- Project Information Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Project Progress Summary (between 200-500 words)
- MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table
- Concise summary of conclusions
- Recommendation Summary Table

**2.** Introduction *(2-3 pages)*
- Purpose of the MTR and objectives
- Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR, MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations to the MTR
- Structure of the MTR report

**3.** Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*
- Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
- Problems that the project sought to address threats and barriers targeted
- Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any)
- Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
- Project timing and milestones
- Main stakeholders: summary list

**4.** Findings *(12-14 pages)*

**4.1** Project Strategy
- Project Design
- Results Framework/Logframe

**4.2** Progress Towards Results
- Progress towards outcomes analysis
- Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

**4.3** Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
- Management Arrangements
- Work planning

[8] The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes).

- Finance and co-finance
- Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
- Stakeholder engagement
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Reporting
- Communications & Knowledge Management

**4.4** Sustainability

- Financial risks to sustainability
- Socio-economic to sustainability
- Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
- Environmental risks to sustainability

**5.** Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)*

**5.1** Conclusions

- Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR's findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project

**5.2** Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

**6.** Annexes

- MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
- MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
- Example Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection
- Ratings Scales
- MTR mission itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report)
- Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
- Signed MTR final report clearance form
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report
- *Annexed in a separate file:* Relevant midterm tracking tools (UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for Gakkum, ICCWC Indicator Framework, PortMATE assessment*) and Core Indicators*
- *Annexed in a separate file: GEF Co-financing template (categorizing co-financing amounts by source as 'investment mobilized' or 'recurrent expenditure')*

## ToR ANNEX C: Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix Template

*(Draft questions to be filled out by the Commissioning Unit with support from the Project Team)*
This Midterm Review Evaluative Matrix must be fully completed/amended by the consultant and included in the MTR inception report and as an Annex to the MTR report. This is a generic list with sample questions.

| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?** | | | |
| To what extent were the project objectives and outputs aligned with member States' and other | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| project stakeholders' development strategies? | | | |
| Were theproject's expected accomplishments and indicators of achievements properly designed, timebound and achievable? | | | |
| **Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** | | | |
| How effective was the project in building the capacity of policymaker on (…)? | | | |
| To what extent does the project contribute to the objective of enhanced capacity of (…) to use the tools and mechanisms developed under this project to (…)? | | | |
| Do the project-related activities give the participants adequate access to the benefits and implications of the project? | | | |
| **Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation? To what extent has progress been made in the implementation of social and environmental management measures? Have there been changes to the overall project risk rating and/or the identified types of risks as outlined at the CEO Endorsement stage?** | | | |
| What was the level of involvement of (please insert division name) staff in meeting the requests for technical advice? | | | |
| How efficiently were human and financial resources used to deliver activities and outputs, in coordination with stakeholders? | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non - achievement of the project objectives? | | | |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?** | | | |
| To what extent has support from other stakeholders, donors, or other multi-lateral or national partners been obtained to take forward positive outcomes resulting from the project? | | | |
| Was there adequate ownership of the project by the end-users, beneficiaries, and was there commitment<br><br>displayed by them? | | | |

## ToR ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[9]

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

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

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at _____ *(Place)* on _____ *(Date)*

Signature: _____

## ToR ANNEX E: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table + Rating Scales

[9] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

**MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Combatting illegal and unsustainable trade in endangered species in Indonesia**

| Measure | MTR Rating | Achievement Description |
|---|---|---|
| **Project Strategy** | N/A | |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| | Etc. | |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) | |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) | |

| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as "good practice". |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) |
|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as "good practice". |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project's closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

## ToR ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed and signed by the Commissioning Unit and RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit (M&E Focal Point)**

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

**Regional Technical Advisor (Nature, Climate and Energy)**

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

**ToR ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the Midterm Review of Combatting illegal and unsustainable trade in endangered species in Indonesia (UNDP Project ID-PIMS 5391)**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and not by the person's name, and track change comment number ("#" column):*

| Author | # | Para No./ comment location | Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report | MTR team response and actions taken |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

**ToR ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix**

**Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)**

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Objective:** To reduce the volume of unsustainable wildlife trade and the rate of loss of globally significant biodiversity in Indonesia and East and South-East Asia | 0.1: Extent to which legal or policy or institutional frameworks are in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems. (IRRF Output 2.5 indicator 2.5.1) | UU5/1990 need to be revised (the current law has not specifically addressed IWT issue; PP7/1999 has not been revised | Midterm target level achieved. 1. **For PermenLHK No 447/2003** (**Regulation of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry Number 447/2003**) related to Procedure for Taking, Captivating, and Circulation of Plants and Wildlife currently under review by Legal Department, Directorate General of Natural Resources, and Ecosystem Conservation. The process of PermenLHK 447 revision postponed due to the Government of Indonesia's Omnibus Law drafting. The CIWT Project and Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation will continue the process | At least 3 additional policies/laws under review; Policy and institutional framework with specification on articles related to IWT PP7/1999, PP8/1999, Permen 447/2003 Working procedure of DG Gakkum and DG KSDAE, as well as MoEF and Ministry of Marine and Fisheries are developed. | At least 2 additional laws/policies completed Articles on IWT are accommodated in the revised UU 5/90 National strategy for combating IWT developed | | | |

[10]Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[11] Populate with data from the Project Document
[12] If available
[13] Colour code this column only
[14] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | after omnibus law drafting.<br>2. While, for **PermenLHK No 8/1999 (Regulation of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry Number 8/1999)** , a ToR has been prepared to review the regulation. The consultant expected to review the state of the art on existing regulations and its interconnection with other agencies' regulations, such as quarantine, customs, etc. The task will be held on the second semester of 2020 and expected to produce a road map for improvement on combatting illegal wildlife regulations from a law enforcement perspective.<br>3. In response to the absence of a comprehensive framework that bridges efforts on law enforcement and combatting illegal wildlife trade, and to achieve the end of target | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | level, CIWT project in collaboration with DG of Law Enforcement, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, initiated **the development of National Strategy and Action Plan for Combatting Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Wild Animals (Nastra CIWT)**.<br>The Nastra CIWT by DG of Law Enforcement and CIWT's project is the first national strategy in the world to use system dynamics modeling to compile national strategy and action plan for combatting illegal wildlife trade.<br>The study conducted by YIARI (Local NGO that affiliate with International NGO-IARI) and initial results has identified 3 dynamic pillars of IWT (Ev1-1st Draft Nastra CIWT Leverage System Analysis). Namely, organization resilience, IWT supply chain, and judicial system. The study now pursues the leverage component using | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Analytical Hierarchy Process and Qualitative Politicized Influence Diagram (QPID).<br>4. To overcome the problem with a legal and scientific approach for prosecution related illegal wildlife crime, CIWT Project initiated **Wildlife Economic Valuation to Support Legal Processes**. This study conducted by LPPM IPB (Bogor Agriculture University) with three main approaches through market price method, willingness to pay-method, and cost-based approach, purposed to find the economic value of the 25 most traded animal species in Indonesia.<br>The benefit of this study as the references for law enforcers in determined the economic value of animal traded. The value of wildlife in wildlife crime case handling due to the prosecution criticized does not reflect the "true value." This study has practical value, as well as scientific value, as a reference for judges and prosecutors for more optimized prosecution.<br>Initial study results showed the optimized | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | effort to prosecute illegal wildlife trade is a combination of market price method and cost-based approach. The study also suggested the ecological approach for further study aims a better "true value" for wildlife (Ev2-1st Draft Economic Value Assessment of Protected Wildlife to Support Legal Processes).<br>Responded to this initial study, Director General of Law Enforcement MoEF, Rasio Ridho Sani appreciated and commented on this study as an initial step and breakthrough in combatting illegal wildlife trade (Ev3-MoM FGD Economic Value Assessment of Protected Wildlife)<br>5. Through CIWT's microgrant, the project initiated a collaboration with The Indonesian Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK/Pusat Pelaporan dan Analisis Transaksi Keuangan) developed a **Guidelines on how to use money laundering regime to combat wildlife crime**. Currently, crime-related illegal wildlife trade | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | became a predicate of crime in Act No. 8/2020 on Prevention of the Money Laundering (Ev4-[Draft] Guidelines on How to use money laundering regime to combat wildlife crime).<br>6. To promote and localize national Fatwa of Indonesian Ulama Council (MUI) on Combatting Wildlife Crime, several activities using religious approach has conducted in several cities.<br>- Jakarta, attended by 15 peoples. Attendees came from Dewan Kemakmuran Masjid (DKM/Mosque Prosperity Council) from around Pramuka Bird Market. The market was renowned as the biggest animal market in Jakarta and Indonesia.<br>- Medan, North Sumatera, attended by local MUI and Regional Police Office of North Sumatera.<br>-Surabaya, East Java, attended by 30 peoples. Attendees came from young Muslim preachers | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | from Surabaya and its surrounding areas.<br>- Jakarta, socialization of Fatwa MUI conducted in International Conference on Law, Religion, Culture, and Culture in Achieving Sustainable Development held by Nasional University (Universitas Nasional) on October 31, 2019 (Ev5-WWF Microgrant Final Report). | | | | | |
| | 0.2: Number of direct project beneficiaries:<br>- Number of government agency staff including enforcement officers who improved their knowledge and skills on IWT due to the project (m/f)<br>- Number of local people in project demonstration areas benefiting from engagement in conservation | 0 | a. 530 personnel (53% against midterm target level or 25% against the end of target level) have improved their knowledge of IWT through training, focus group discussions, and workshops.<br><br>1. Enhancing knowledge on animal handling in illegal wildlife operation, the project compiled standard operating procedures (SOP) on animal handling for primates, mammals, reptiles, and birds for Police Officer (Polhut). With the availability of these guidelines is expected animal handling process by Polhut can be carried out properly | At least 1000 personnel have improved knowledge on IWT (500m/500f);<br><br>At least 300 local people in project demo areas benefit directly from project intervention (150m/150f); | At least 2100 personal have improved knowledge on IWT (1050m/1050f);<br>At least 600 local people in project demo areas benefit directly from project intervention (300m/300f); | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | activities, reduced HWC impacts and improved livelihoods (m/f) | | (Ev12-SOP Animal Handling).<br><br>2. The project in cooperation with The Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) **developed SOP of collecting and handling biological material from wild animals and plants by morphological and DNA analysis**. The project's hope that this guide could support proper and comprehensive law enforcement on wildlife crime; and other activities such as wildlife survey and monitoring (Ev13- Guideline Morphological Analysis) (Ev14 Guideline Genetic Analysis).<br><br>b. Reduced HWC conflicts, CIWT's project has conducted several HWC training and community-based training for local communities:<br><br>1. HWC training, through microgrant held by WWF, has been conducted in Krueng Saee watershed area | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (DAS); Village of Alue Limeng, Krueng Sabe, and Pintu Rime, district of Bireun. The training attended by 25 local peoples (20 males, 5 females). The HWC training materials covered conservation and conflict mitigation with the elephant (Ev5-WWF Microgrant Final Report).<br><br>2. A training workshop carried out in the Masigit Karembi Forest Conservation Area delivered through microgrant by YIARI. The training intended to raise the capacities of local conservation groups and volunteers. A total of 14 peoples from the local community attended the training. The training on ecology and conservation as a part of community-based patrols around habitat areas of slow loris. Increased involvement of local communities in community-based patrols aimed to prevent poaching and reduced hunting and trading | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | around habitat areas (Ev6).<br><br>3. A training of workshops for local communities has been conducted in Gunung Sawal Wildlife Reserve, West Java. The training attended by 15 local people around the release sites of slow loris. The participants now actively assisting the release project of slow loris by YIARI (Ev6-YIARI Microgrant Final Report).<br><br>4. Workshops on identifying threats to the habitat of wildlife have been conducted in 2 villages around Gunung Sawal Wildlife Reserve, West Java. The training attended by 50 people among other village government officials, community figures, and local activists. This training intended to raise awareness on community-based illegal wildlife poaching preventions (Ev6-YIARI Microgrant Final Report). | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | c. Development of livelihood alternative programs to reduce illegal wildlife trade has been conducted in Northern Sumatera and West Java:<br><br>1. The training of non-wood forest products (HHBK) on beekeeping has been conducted in Village of Ranto Perlak, Sub-District of Perlak, East Aceh Regency. The training attended by 23 local peoples (18 males, 6 females) on management and development of beekeeping of *kelulut* (stingless bee) or "*linot*" in the local dialect (Ev5-WWF Microgrant Final Report).<br><br>2. Social mapping on livelihood alternatives has been conducted in Tanjungsari Village, Sadanaya subdistrict, Ciamis Regency. This village had a direct border to Gunung Sawal Wildlife Reserve. The population of Tanjungsari Village reached 4.435 people (2.265 males and 2.170 females. Using | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Sustainable Livelihood Analysis (SLA) dan SWOT Analysis, recommended establishment Desa Wisata Tanjungsari "Sahabat Kukang"/Tourist Village of Tanjungsari "Friends of Loris" as an alternative livelihood (Ev6-YIARI Microgrant Final Report).<br><br>3. Focus Group Discussions with village representatives have been conducted in Tegal Hamlet, Mekarsari Village, Pasir Jambu subdistrict, Bandung Regency to identify current and alternative livelihoods. It was agreed with the target community to use of cattle manure would be a useful product for using in the biodigester (Ev6-YIAR Microgrant Final Report).<br><br>While, gender equality not easily fulfilled, due to the limited availability of female forest police. | | | | | |
| | 0.3: Expert evaluation of IWT annual volume | 4666 wild animals are seized from 34 protected species | Mid and end of project target levels have been achieved (100%). | Increasing number of cases prosecuted | Increasing number of settled cases on IWT | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (number of animal specimens – body parts or live animals) in Indonesia based on the WCS IWT database | 51 cases prosecuted (LAKIP 2016)<br><br>Source: LAKIP, Gakkum 2016 | Based on data from Directorate of Criminal Law Enforcement, Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forest showed an increasing number of cases prosecuted and settled cases on illegal wildlife trade.<br>The data of the number of cases prosecuted from 2016-2019 was 51, 55, 41, and 65, respectively (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019). While for settled cases was 51 (2016), 55 (2017), 41 (2018), and 65 (2019). (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019). Compared to the previous year, LAKIP Gakkum not used as a data source due to a lack of access for data compilation. For years come, LAKIP Gakkum would be used as an official data source. | | | | | |
| | 0.4: Number of individuals of IWT flagship species (Sumatran Tiger, Sumatran | 2015: Tiger (5 poached); Elephant (7 poached); Rhino (1 poached); Anoa (10 poached), Babirusa (12), Black-crested macaque (~200) | To identify on poached flagship species, the Project will conduct a magnitude on wildlife trade in the second semester of 2020. A ToR has been prepared by PMU. | >20% reduction from baseline | >40% reduction from baseline | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rhinoceros, Sumatran Elephant, Black-crested macaque, Anoa and Babirusa) killed by poachers annually in the 2 project demonstration areas | | One of effort to reduce poaching as a direct threat to wildlife, CIWT Project supported protected area management conducted snare removal in two project demonstration areas.<br>As stated by both Director General of Law Enforcement of Environment and Forestry and Director General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Indonesia now faced snares as a serious threat to Indonesian wildlife.<br>Directorate of Forest Protection, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, supported by CIWT, conducted 4 (four) snare removal patrols:<br>• In August 2019, 8 teams from GLNP conducted 10 days patrol and found 108 mesh snares.<br>• BKSDA Aceh conducted 10-day patrols in September 2019, covered a total area of 276.075 ha(s). Five teams found and destroyed 63 mesh snares. | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | • Between November-December 2019, eight teams from BBKSDA Riau conducted a 10-day patrol covered a total area of 226,319,09 ha. They found and destroyed 170 mesh snares.<br>• In December 2019, 12 teams from BNWNP conducted a 10-day patrol covered distance of 70 km and 600 ha total area. The teams found a massive 945 meshes. | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1:** Effective national framework for managing wildlife trade. Strengthened national policy, legal and institutional framework for regulating illegal commercial wildlife trade and combating illegal wildlife trade | 1.1: The following key legislation gaps are addressed by improved IWT legislation documents approved by Government: -Minimum fines and sentences increased to provide deterrent effect; -Non-native endangered species including elephant, | 0 | Based on data from Directorate of Forest Protection, Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, 12 operations of illegal wildlife trade conducted for the year 2019. The number of wildlife and its body parts seized from those trafficking operations 167 and 1.270, respectively (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019). While related to fines and sentences analysis, the CIWT project collaborates with the Directorate of Criminal Law Enforcement will | -Minimum fines increase by 25%<br><br>Average sentences increase by 10% on baseline.<br><br>Indonesian protected species list updated to include all CITES Appendix 1 and globally threatened species, including non-native species | All key gaps incorporated in the issued legislation and be implemented | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | rhinoceros, big cat and pangolin species given legal protection<br>-Indonesian protected species list updated to include all CITES Appendix 1 and globally threatened species<br>- Authority of forestry civil investigators improved<br>- Detention/prison evaluation for creating deterrent effect and rehabilitation for criminals.<br>- Online trade regulation to address online wildlife trafficking. | | conduct a deep-dive analysis on fines and sentences based on cases prosecuted in the second semester of 2020.<br>,The project initiated to compile a syllabus for illegal wildlife trade. The syllabus compiled by the Human Resources Counselling and Development Agency (BP2SDM) Ministry of Environment and Forestry consists of four modules: Wildlife Conservation; International Cooperation on Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade; First Handling Action on Criminal Wildlife Trade; and Administration on Captivating and Circulation of Wildlife.<br>A Focus Group Discussion conducted with representatives of Training Centre of Indonesian Attorney General, Training Centre of Criminal Investigation Agency Indonesian National Police; Training Centre of Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK/Pusat Pelaporan dan Analisis Transaksi Keuangan); Human Resources | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Agency of Ministry of Maritime and Fisheries Affairs; and Animal Quarantine Center Ministry of Agriculture (Ev8- MoM FGD Syllabus for illegal wildlife trade). The latest progress, the project has intensive communication with BP2SDM for the legalization of training syllabus and to be recognized as a standard for combating illegal wildlife trade syllabus in Ministry of Environment an and Forestry particularly. Related CITES, the project has intensive collaboration with Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation, DG KSDAE on data collection for CITES related illegal wildlife smuggling. | | | | | |
| | 1.2: Inter-agency taskforce in place and operational as indicated/measured by the signing of an inter-agency agreements targeting IWT | 0 | Mid and end of project target level have been achieved (100%). Despite accomplishment at the end of the project target level, inter-agency cooperation still conducted with other law enforcers. Snare removal patrols and illegal wildlife operations involve the Indonesian National Police (Ev7- | Inter-agency taskforce in place and operational;<br><br>1 inter agency collaboration agreement | Inter-agency taskforce operational;<br><br>1 formal inter agency collaboration agreements | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019), as well as, Indonesian Customs Office on data collection of smuggling and repatriation.<br>The project supported the Directorate of Forest Protection conducted collaborations with the Indonesian Attorney General Office, Indonesian National Police, and other ministries (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019). The project also involved other law enforcers compile a syllabus on combatting illegal wildlife trade, as pointed out in 1.1.<br>To support other law enforcers on combatting illegal wildlife trade, the project has a plan to compile a mobile application to identify protected wildlife species. A ToR has been compiled by PMU. This android and IOS based application would be expected came out as a big help for law enforcers in the field such as forest rangers, customs, polices, and coast guards in wildlife identification. Hampered by a lack of technical | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | knowledge became a big concern for law enforcers related to their duty to identify protected and non-protected wildlife. This application expected to accelerate decisions in the identification of illegal wildlife in the field.<br>The project also supported Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry and Indonesian National Police Office to set up a Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA) with the Dutch Government through Dutch Embassy in Indonesia in August 2019. This MLA dubbed as the first MLA in Indonesia related to illegal wildlife trade (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019).<br>To strengthen coordination between the task force initiated by Bitung Municipality, a ToR has been compiled by Environment Agency of Bitung with the project to arrange a coordination workshop. The activity slightly needs to change due to Covid-19 pandemics and | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | will be conducted in the second semester of 2020. | | | | | |
| Outcome 2: Institutional capacity for implementation and enforcement at the national and international levels. Strengthened institutional capacity for regulatory coordination, implementation and enforcement at the national and international levels | 2.1: Strengthened institutional capacity to combat IWT as indicated by i) the ICCWC Indicator Framework (note – baselines to be determined in year 1) ii) UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for Gakkum (see Annex 18) iii) Operational status of Gakkum's Information System | i)ICCWC Indicator Framework – Baseline scores TBD ii)UNDP CD Scorecard Baseline Score: 60% iii) Operational database within Gakkum | - Series of workshops to enhance capacity of Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry has been conducted. The project also compiled a series of SOP's on animal handling and a syllabus on combatting illegal wildlife trade. - The project has compiled TOR's to update ICCWC Indicator Framework, and CD Scorecard. The activities slightly postponed due to Covid-19 pandemics. The project will continue to update the scorecards in the second semester of 2020. - Related Gakkum's Information System, the project has contributed to the setup Gakkum's Operation Room and enhance the capacity of the Gakkum's staffs on advanced intelligence training on online wildlife trade. Based on online patrols, the Directorate of Forest Protection found 1.513 online wildlife trade activities between October 2017-December 2019. | i)ICCWC Indicator Framework – Midterm targets TBD ii)UNDP CD Scorecard Midterm Target:70% iii) Data sharing agreements enacted between government agencies | i)ICCWC Indicator Framework – Project Completion targets TBD ii)UNDP CD Scorecard EOP Target: 80% iii) Information System is fully operational and operated by trained staff | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2.2:<br>- Annual number seizures/ arrests<br>- Annual number of successful prosecutions | Official national statistics on seizures/arrests and prosecutions<br><br>From mid-2015 to mid-2016: The WCU facilitated law enforcement operations for 31 cases with 55 people arrested and taken to court. Of those with a known outcome, 41 were prosecuted (100% prosecution). This is for terrestrial species in Sumatra and Java. | Mid and end of project target levels have been achieved (100%).<br>Refers to official national statistics on arrests and prosecutions of illegal wildlife trade by Directorate of Criminal Law Enforcement, DG of Law Enforcement, MoEF, for the year 2016, as the baseline, showed 51 cases of arrests and prosecuted. For the year 2019, the number of cases of arrests and prosecuted arose to 65 cases of arrests and prosecuted. It shows a 27,5% increase of the arrests from baseline, surpassed end of the project target level.<br>Meanwhile, the number of cases prosecuted shows 65 cases or 100% cases prosecuted. The score is surely enough to surpass the end of the project target level, as requested (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019). | Official national statistics on seizure/arrests and prosecutions<br><br>>10% increase in seizures/arrests from baseline<br>>50% cases prosecuted | Official national statistics on seizures/arrests and prosecutions<br><br>>25% increase in seizures/arrests from baseline<br>>75% cases prosecuted | | | |
| | 2.3:<br>- Annual number of joined up transnational counter-IWT operations- | No transnational operations | The midterm target has been achieved.<br>To reach the end of the project target level, the project will conduct one transnational repatriation (for Indonesian endemic birds) from Philippines | 1 transnational operation/seizure | 3 transnational operations/seizures | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - Annual number of seizures as a result of transnational counter-IWT operations | | to Indonesia. The activity will be conducted in the second semester of 2020 (July 21, 2020). | | | | | |
| **Outcome 3:** Scaling-up improved enforcement strategy at key trade ports and connected ecosystems. Improved enforcement strategy demonstrated and scaled up at key trade ports and connected subnational regions with key ecosystems | 3.1: Enforcement effectiveness at 5 key trade ports (Jakarta, Surabaya, Bitung, Belawan and Kualanamu airport), indicated by: - Annual PortMATE assessment tool scores (average score for KSDA, Customs, Port Management Authority at each port) | PortMATE Baseline scores: Surabaya (Tg Perak):17.00 Belawan: 18.67 (Jakarta, Bitung and Kualanamu to be done in Year 1) | The project has compiled ToR's to update the PortMate scores in Bitung, Surabaya, and Belawan. The activities need slightly to change, due to Covid-19 pandemics. The project will update the score in the second semester of 2020. | 25% increase over baseline score | 50% increase over baseline score | | | |
| | 3.2: Effective enforcement of two subnational regions known to include significant wildlife trade routes, measured by: | 4666 wild animals seized from 34 protected species<br><br>Source: LAKIP, Gakkum 2016 | Mid and end of project target levels have been achieved (100%). Based on data from Directorate of Criminal Law Enforcement, Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry, Ministry of | Increasing number of cases prosecuted (c.10%) | Increasing number of settled cases on IWT by …% | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | - annual number of IWT seizures at the project sites<br>- annual number of IWT investigations leading to arrests at the project sites;<br>- annual number of successful IWT prosecutions at the project sites | | Environment and Forest showed an increasing number of cases prosecuted and settled cases on illegal wildlife trade.<br>Referred to data from Directorate of Criminal Law Enforcement, Directorate General of Law Enforcement on Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, for the year 2016, as a baseline, showed 51 cases prosecuted. For the year 2019, the number of cases prosecuted showed 65. It is showed a 27,5% increases compared to baseline (Ev7-LAKIP DG of Law Enforcement 2019). | | | | | |
| **Outcome 4:** Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming. Implementation and upscaling/replication of project approaches at national and international levels | 4.1: number of project lessons documented and used by other national and international projects. | 0 | 1. The project, with YIARI, developed an SOP for translocation, habituation, and post-release monitoring for slow loris. To learn on the slow-loris management, **a Malaysian non-government organization, 1stop Borneo Wildlife**, | At least 3 project lessons used by other national and international projects | At least 5 project lessons used by other national and international projects | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| is supported by effective knowledge management and gender **mainstreaming** | | | conducted a learning session for habituation and post-release management. They have the plan to build a slow loris rehabilitation center in Sabah, Malaysia.<br><br>YIARI, through microgrant funded by CIWT, also collaborates with other NGOs on the implementation of SOP for translocation, habituation, and post-release monitoring for slow loris. Animal handling resulting from law enforcement with **PPS Tasikoki in North Sulawesi**. While with **SOCP** (Sumatera Orangutan Conservation Program) in the handling and release of seized four slow lorises and two langurs (Ev6-YIARI Microgrant Final Report).<br><br>2. To reach out to more institutions and personnel on improving knowledge of combatting illegal wildlife trade, the project has the plan to set up a knowledge management system for e-learning. For the first step, the | | | | | |

| Project Strategy | Indicator[10] | Baseline Level[11] | Level in 3rd PIR (self- reported) | Midterm Target[12] | End-of-project Target | Midterm Level & Assessment[13] | Achievement Rating[14] | Justification for Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | project has produced a video series on collecting and handling biological material from wild animals and plants by morphological and DNA analysis. The production is expected available in August 2020.<br><br>3. The project also conducted a Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) Survey to support communication strategy for a social marketing campaign on IWT. The survey implemented by Lembaga Demografi, University of Indonesia.<br><br>The survey is aimed to understand the current situation on the IWT-related issues, challenges, and opportunities in Indonesia to combat IWT, as well as the knowledge, attitude, and practices of the campaign's target audience groups.<br><br>Due to Covid-19 Pandemics, the survey slightly backs off from the schedule. | | | | | |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

## ToR ANNEX I: GEF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)

[1] Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards
[1] Populate with data from the Project Document
[1] If available
[1] Colour code this column only
[1] Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, H