Final independent project evaluation of

Country Programme Indonesia-Sub-Programme 1: Strengthening Criminal Justice responses on Forest Crimes to Support REDD+ Implementation in Indonesia

INDA02
Indonesia

September 2016

This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Mr. Peter Allan, Director, Allan Consultancy Ltd. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provides normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process of projects. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime can be contacted at:

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna, Austria
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0
Email: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process , but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

CLP	Core Learning Partners
CP	Country Programme
DFID	Department for International Development
ER	Evaluation Report
FO	Field Office
GP	Global Programme
HRDDP	Human Rights Due Diligence Policy
ICCWC	International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
INP	Indonesian National Police
IR	Inception Report
KOMINDA	Regional Intelligence Community
KPK	Corruption Eradication Commission
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forestry
MRV	Monitoring Reporting and Verification
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PPATK	Indonesian Financial Transactions Reports and Analysis Centre
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
RO	Regional Office
SC	Supreme Court
SES	Social and Environmental Standards
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCAC	United Nations Convention Against Corruption
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNPDF	United Nations Partnership for Development Framework
UNTOC	United Nations Convention on Transnational Organized Crime
WLFC	Wildlife and Forest Crime

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Indonesia's forests are among the most extensive and diverse in the world. Indonesia is ranked eighth among countries with extensive forest and has the third largest expanse of tropical forest following Brazil and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Covering approximately two-thirds of Indonesia's land area, the Indonesian forest estate generates income and jobs and provides livelihoods for millions of people.[1]

However, the Indonesian forests are threatened by rapid deforestation and forest degradation. According to new high-resolution satellite-based maps released by Global Forest Watch in 2015, Indonesia's average tree cover loss was 1.6 million hectares per year from 2011-2013. Deforestation and forest degradation in Indonesia are a result of a number of legal and illegal activities related to logging, forest fires, establishment of timber plantations and estate crops, and expansion of mining activities. The contribution of illegal activities – such as illegal logging, encroachment, and illicit trade in forest products - to deforestation is substantial. It is estimated that illegal logging accounts for more than 40% of Indonesia's total wood supply, and some studies estimate the annual timber production from illegal sources to be as high as 76% (Luttrell et. al, 2011).

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has been involved in combating forest crime in Indonesia since 2010 through the implementation of two previous programme phases. The first programme phase was implemented from 2010 to 31 September 2013 while the second programme phase started 1 December 2013 and was finalised on the 29th July 2016.

This is a final, independent project evaluation conducted as the second programme closes and as envisaged in the project document. It covers the geographic jurisdiction of Indonesia with a special focus on the three project target areas: Keerom District (Papua), Raja Ampat District (West Papua) and Kapuas District (Central Kalimantan). The evaluation was conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lessons learned. This external evaluation is also in line with the UNODC Evaluation Policy, norms and standards. The evaluation seeks to provide accountability to all stakeholders by determining whether the project objectives were met or not, assess the utilization of resources, identify areas for improvement and to learn lessons for executing the next phase of the project as well as formulate a strategy after the life of the project.

This evaluation report is constructed under the following methodological approach. Initially the Inception Report completed a desk review of Project documentation. From this any gaps that existed in the information required to fulfil the Terms of Reference (ToR) requirements were identified and a small number of additional questions were added to the ToR. Subsequently four data collection instruments were developed and deployed. These were; Semi-structured interviews, Most Significant Change (MSC) narration, field visit and two case studies.

Through the use of these data collection instruments enough appropriate information was generated to complete the evaluation as per the ToR. The Likert Scale questions (questions asking

---

[1] INDA02 Annual Donor Report

for a response by nominating a number from a range of numbers, in this case 1 to 7) in the semi-structured interviews and certain aspects of both the desk review material and the case studies supplied the quantitative data. The semi-structured interviews, the MSC narration analysis and specific aspects of both the desk review material and the case studies supplied the qualitative data. By applying this mixed, primary and secondary, multi-sourced data against the ToR questions appropriate triangulation of data was achieved.

There is little doubt that forest crime falls under the broad remit of UNODC. This specific Project on Strengthening Criminal Justice responses on Forest Crimes to Support Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) Implementation in Indonesia (known hereafter as 'the Project') is part of UNODC's Country Programme (CP) for Indonesia - Sub-Programme 1: Illicit Trafficking and Transnational Organised Crime, Outcome 1.4 on Wildlife and forest crimes. The initial design of the Project was informed by the results from the previous project and the effort made by UNODC in Indonesia in the first phase of the 2010 – 2013 Project.

The Project's main **objective** is to ensure "*REDD+ Implementation in 3 districts in 3 hot-spot provinces in Indonesia strengthened through effective criminal justice responses on forest crime*".[2] The **outcome** from this objective is defined as "*Crime associated with forest and wildlife, namely illegal logging, encroachment and forest fires identified and acted on in Keerum district (Papua), Raja Ampat district (West Papua) and Kapuas district (Central Kalimantan)*".[3]

The five **outputs** are;

1. Reviewed policies, laws, decrees and with recommendations for improved criminal justice responses according to international standards;
2. Database on forest crime (illegal logging, illegal encroachment, forest fires) associated with Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) of REDD+ implementation improved;
3. Capacity of law enforcement agencies and the judiciary (including Forest Rangers) in Keerom District – near the border of Papua New Guinea (Papua), Raja Ampat District (West Papua) and Kapuas District (Central Kalimantan) strengthened;
4. A zero burning policy including measures on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification on illegal logging, illegal encroachment and forest fires to promote cooperation between responsible agencies within and across borders with Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei have been proposed to the responsible agencies;
5. Involvement of Community groups and NGOs/CSOs in supporting compliance of legislation, practices and programmes to prevent forest crimes.

This evaluation report is satisfied that the vast majority of activities conducted under the auspices of the Project contributed toward reaching the main objective of the Project. In particular the Project was well managed and did not suffer from any form of 'mission creep' away from the main objective and remained focussed on the three areas identified. There are certain lessons to be learned with regard to what works as an 'effective criminal justice response on forest crime' within the Project, however these are nuances within the main outputs of the Project which do support and address the main objective.

Where the Project lacked adherence to its original outcome was a skewing of resources toward illegal logging at the expense of encroachment and forest fires. This evaluation report is of the opinion that with the relatively limited resources available of US $1m over the period of the Project the initial outputs were overly ambitious. It was wise Project Management to concentrate on what was agreed to be the single, largest forest crime of illegal logging. At that time it was

_____

2 INDA02 Project Document p16
3 INDA02 Project Document p16

also following what appeared to be the will of many stakeholders to focus in this area. However a hangover of this decision is the relatively large desire now from a range of stakeholders for any new Project to more fully consider and tackle the issue of forest fires. This evaluation is not of the opinion that the new Project must address this issue, however there must be a transparent and inclusive approach to determining the focus and subject areas of any new Project. There is a possibility that with only one donor the Project will be driven more by donor request than beneficiary needs and UNODC strategy within country and regional programming.

The subject of forest crime is intrinsically linked to corruption and money laundering. The Project has recognised this truism and has dedicated training resources in the areas of anti-corruption and anti-money laundering. It has additionally provided training in other areas such as crime scene management, community patrolling, intelligence gathering and informant handling. Whilst many of these other areas are worthy and of value (in particular community patrolling) there is a danger that the training component of the Project becomes dilute and loses focus. There is an argument for focusing all training on two or three key areas of which corruption and money laundering should be seriously considered. Additionally there would appear to be compelling arguments to include closer cooperation and liaison with local community leaders and chiefs from both a partnership and sustainability perspective. The feedback received by the evaluation from interviews with those law enforcement officers involved directly in the small, local communities is that recognition of their (the community leaders and chiefs) status through closer, direct interaction with the Project could pay good medium to longer term dividends.

When bearing in mind the impact of the training it is important to note that the two concrete examples of the training making a difference came less from the specific knowledge imparted by the training but more from the feeling of empowerment it gave the officers who attended the training. These 'softer' aspects of any subsequent training development should not be overlooked nor dismissed without serious consideration. This also highlights one further aspect of the training namely the high standard of the trainers. This evaluation could find no reference to suggest anything other than highly competent trainers and the use of local trainers wherever possible was also greatly appreciated. Should the new Project continue to use training as a capacity building tool it appears to have a suitable pool of trainers from which to continue that work.

The entire area of measuring impact in any new Project must be addressed with greater attention to detail. Many of the quantitative indicators developed to measure the success of this Project rely on third party interventions over which this Project with a relatively small budget and resources has no control. This has an impact on, for example, the indicator on the number of convictions which can be used as a measurement of behavioural change but is difficult to apply to a Project with limited resources. These challenges in developing suitable indicators to monitor short, medium and long term results are not easy to overcome but they must be addressed.

The Project itself was effective in delivering its activities in what is a challenging geographic environment. These activities have resulted in the Project, in general, meeting four of the five outputs. This statement should be tempered by the knowledge that the Project did focus on illegal logging at the expense of encroachment and forest fires. This evaluation believes this was the correct decision to make given the relatively small amount of resources available to the Project and beneficiary feedback at the time but as a result far less progress on those specific areas of encroachment and forest fires were achieved. It may have been prudent to have altered the outputs during subsequent project revisions.

The one output where the Project struggled to deliver was output No.2 on information sharing. By-and-large this occurred due to circumstances outside the Project and UNODC

control but it should give pause for reflection if 'information sharing' is to form part of a new Project. Deeper risk assessments will have to be undertaken if this is the case.

The final strand of the capacity building remit of the Project outside of training and information exchange culminated with the Projects use of the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit. The Toolkit was developed by UNODC HQ with support from CITES, INTERPOL, World Bank, and WCO (the five agencies form the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime). However, the project has used the 'Toolkit' as a basis for two assessments on the Indonesia legal framework relating to wildlife and forest crime and on law enforcement capacity to address these crimes. Further, the project has arranged for the Toolkit to be translated to Bahasa Indonesia in cooperation with UNORCID. This has been widely praised within the various stakeholder groups and any new Project would do well to make the distribution and implementation of the Toolkit an integral part of their strategy.

Whilst the Project has been quite effective there have been a number of efficiency issues. These difficulties included i) the loss of a Project Associate in early 2015 whose replacement took nine months to appoint ii) the introduction of Umoja (a UN wide Enterprise Resource Planning System) which severely curtailed Project activity four months at the end of 2015 and iii) the merger of Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Environment into the one Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) in January 2015. The Project team did their best to manage stakeholder expectations during a difficult 2015 but these were the main reasons for the no cost extensions that took the Project to its finishing date one year later than originally planned. This evaluation sees little more that the Project team could have done however the wider UNODC must take some responsibility for the length of time it took to replace the Project Associate with an International Associate Expert and – to a lesser extent – the impact of Umoja on all UNODC business including this Project.

The Project itself has one key sustainability issue in that it is funded by only one donor. And whilst the relationship between Project and donor is healthy that may not always be the case and the Project should have a contingency plan in place should funding cease. The outputs of the Project itself also face some sustainability issues. In particular the beneficiaries of the training do not always have the resources to put some of the training into practice. It is therefore incumbent upon the Project to review its training to ensure what it is promoting as good or best practice can be accomplished given the resources available to the participants.

There is a definite need for the Project to be given expertise and guidance in issues of Human Rights and Gender mainstreaming. The Project team are aware of the importance of such issues and have attempted - but with limited success - to implement some mainstreaming practices. Any new Project should examine the existing guidance material on HR and gender mainstreaming, including the 'Gender mainstreaming in the work of UNODC' guidelines document and if issues still exist contact the appropriate experts at HQ. UNODC as an entity has a great deal of experience in these issues and this evaluation is of the opinion that more can be done at all levels (country, regional and HQ) to integrate a consistent approach to these mainstreaming issues.

Overall the Project has achieved a lot with a dedicated country office team (supported by a knowledgeable Regional Office) with relatively limited resources, operating in a challenging environment and coping admirably with a very difficult 2015. It has given good value for money to its donor and there have been concrete examples of the positive impact their capacity building Project – built around quality training – has produced for its beneficiaries. It cooperates well with other key actors and stakeholders and has built partnerships, particularly at national, provincial district and local levels that – in general – work well. This

evaluation sees no reason why a subsequent Project, with some minor alterations, should not achieve further success.

Recommendations

The evaluation recommends that any new Project retains a substantial part of its work in tackling illegal logging. This remains a high priority for all stakeholder groups, crucially beneficiaries and donor. Regarding further areas of interest substantial thought should be given as to whether the Project should reinvigorate its efforts to tackle forest fires. There is conflicting data coming into the evaluation from the beneficiaries in this regard and any new Project should take the proper steps to examine the risks and benefits of dedicating resources to the forest fire issue.

Any geographical expansion of the Project should also consider how stretched resources may become to deal with this expansion. The Project has managed to deliver so far on the majority of its activities however any geographical expansion would need a corresponding expansion of resources or a reduction in other areas.

Finally another key consideration for the Project is to ensure that the activities delivered include and empower the local communities and local community leaders. There is much information from various sources that this approach can greatly assist in changing local perception on forest crime and increase the likelihood of UNODC intervention being more successful in both the short and longer term, thereby improving sustainability of the Project and its activities.

A full list of recommendations can be found within the matrix overleaf and the 'Recommendations' section of this report.

Best practices and lessons learned

Some best practices include the focus on capacity building through training and workshops delivered locally with – as far as possible – local trainers and experts. That training can unlock a feeling of empowerment that encourages individual thought and the confidence to debate strategy and tactics with senior officers in a manner that they felt they couldn't have done before the training. This empowerment comes from the receipt of knowledge allowing them to better argue their case in these discussions.

Additionally the Project has used the concept of Monitoring and Evaluation very much to its benefit. It has used it to assess the quality of its training and trainers, the quality and relevance of the training content and used clustering of training data and feedback to inform the strategic direction of the Project. And the use of the risk register to assist putting in place early response mechanisms for developing situations and the ability to adapt the risk register to a changing environment has proved effective.

The requirement to mainstream Human Rights and Gender into all UNODC work and Projects places an onerous responsibility and task on Project Teams that are often resource stretched and lack the specialist expertise and knowledge to address these issues in a meaningful and effective fashion. UNODC and the wider UN family should consider how its centralised expertise in these areas can be better devolved into the field.

Those implementing any programme (e.g. Umoja) that will have such a substantial effect upon the efficient running of Projects, should better analyse and communicate detail that will allow Project Managers the opportunity to prepare their Projects and Project stakeholders against any potential negative impact.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings[4]	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations[5]
Key recommendations		
Illegal logging is still the single greatest threat to the Indonesian forests. UNODC involvement should continue.	Project documentation Stakeholder interviews MSC narration	Any future Project should continue to include tackling illegal logging as a main priority. *Country Office Project Team*
Much of the conversation around forest crime includes forest fires. The Project Document of 2013 includes forest fires within its outputs but has done little in a practical sense to tackle this crime type primarily due to a lack of resources.	Project documentation Independent, open source research Stakeholder interviews	Any future Project should give close consideration to creating one of the foci within the Project based around the crime of forest fires. The views of all relevant stakeholder groups should be assessed objectively and the decision to include – or not include – the crime of forest fires should be clearly communicated to all parties. *Country Office Project Team*
The Project, on occasion, struggled to deliver all that it promised in its Project Document of 2013. The tackling of forest fires and encroachment was scaled back primarily due to lack of resources. A geographical expansion will place greater burden on an already stretched budget.	Evaluation analysis Stakeholder interviews Project documentation	Any future Project should take great care when assessing the impact of geographical expansion of the Project given the resources available. Therefore, if expansion is to be undertaken either additional resources will have to be found or reductions made in existing Project areas. *Country Office Project Team*
When the Ministry of Forestry was merged with the Ministry of Environment and caused difficulties for the Project the fact the risk register had identified a	Evaluation analysis Project documentation	Maintain and regularly update the risk register. *Country Office Project Team*

_____

[4] A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

[5] Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.

similar situation saw a quick reaction to the new situation.		
The Project struggled to deliver on information sharing aspects. There are many moving parts that must come together for information to be exchanged at any level and UNODC has little control over most of those parts.	Project documentation Stakeholder interviews Evaluator expertise	Any future Project should have a robust consultation mechanism in place to help decide the likelihood of being able to attain effective information sharing platforms / protocols thus providing best value for UNODC Project resources. *COIND / ROSEAP*
Unusually for training based capacity building Projects there is concrete evidence that this approach is working. Feedback is exceptionally strong from all stakeholder groups and the positive case studies are a direct result of the training approach and the quality of the trainers.	Project documentation Stakeholder interviews Case studies	The focus on capacity building through training and workshops delivered locally with – as far as possible – local trainers and experts should continue. *Country Office Project Team*
The Project itself recognises that key component parts of the vast majority of forest crimes include corruption and money laundering. To achieve greatest impact training should focus on areas on commonality between forest crime types.	Project documentation Stakeholder interviews Desk review material	Consider refining the training subject areas with a greater focus on anti-corruption and anti-money laundering elements to the training with refresher training as part of the training cycle. *Country Office Project Team / HQ AML and AC GP Teams*
There is second-hand reporting that the involvement of a community leader led to the detection of some illegal logging. The Project itself recognises the importance of engagement at a local level.	Project documents Stakeholder interviews Desk review material	Include greater cooperation at a local level with community leaders and chiefs by engaging and educating them in UNODC activities and goals for the local population. *Country Office Project Team*
The Project has developed some quantitative indicators that cannot accurately reflect the impact and success of the Project. They rely on too many variables outside the direct or indirect control of the Project.	Project documentation	Greater effort is required to develop a logical framework that uses accurate indicators to measure the impact of the outcomes from the outputs on the overall objective(s) of the Project. *Country Office Project Team / M and E Expertise In-house (UNODC) or external*
The Project has used the concept of Monitoring and Evaluation very much to its benefit. It has used it to assess the quality of its training and trainers, the quality and	Project documentation	The focus on Monitoring and Evaluation, in particular the use of those results to reshape training content, approach and Project strategy should continue. Any new Project

relevance of the training content and used clustering of training data and feedback to inform the strategic direction of the Project.		should consider how to monitor the medium and longer term impact of the training. *Country Office Project Team / M and E Expertise In-house (UNODC) or external*
There is good evidence that the Indonesian Country Programme and the Regional Programme are well integrated. And that the Country Office and Regional Office share a good working relationship. There is less evidence that the Project interfaces effectively with the Global Programmes based at HQ that have a direct bearing on their remit.	Project documentation Desk review material Stakeholder interviews	Implement a systemic process to ensure the relevant thematic Global Programmes based in HQs such as Anti-Corruption, Anti-Money Laundering and Wildlife and Forest Crime can be utilised by the Project thereby ensuring integration of UNODC work across thematic and Country / Regional Programming. *Country Office Indonesia / ROSEAP / Appropriate GPs*
Although the Project Documentation stresses the need and importance of Human Rights and Gender mainstreaming in the Project there is little evidence of this having been implemented. The Project team are keen to do so but appear to lack the knowledge of how this can be achieved in their challenging environment.	Project documentation Stakeholder interviews	The Project should engage the help of Human Rights and Gender mainstreaming experts to assist in these aspects of Project activity. In particular the new Project should carefully examine the Gender Mainstreaming guidelines to ensure all that can be done at the Project level can be achieved autonomously *Country Office Project Team / HQ HR and Gender Experts*

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

Indonesia has the third largest area of tropical rainforest on the planet, with 68% of its landmass - equivalent to 131.3 million ha - covered by forests (Ministry of Forestry, 2012). Deforestation rates in Indonesia are high, with current rates estimated at 1.17 million hectares per year (Government of Indonesia and UNREDD, 2009). Over the last 20 years deforestation has been driven predominantly by agricultural expansion, especially of oil palm plantation monocultures[6].

Other drivers of deforestation include smallholder shifting cultivation and subsistence agriculture, mining, logging, aquaculture and forest fires; both natural and human induced to clear land for other uses.

Map 1 – Satellite map of Indonesia[7]

The UNODC INDA02 Project on Strengthening Criminal Justice responses on Forest Crimes to Support Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) Implementation in Indonesia (known hereafter as 'the Project') is the natural successor to the first project phase which started in 2010 and finished on 31 September 2013. Stakeholder participation in the Project activities was conducted at national level and provincial level, namely Papua, West Papua and Central Kalimantan (see Map 2 overleaf). Central Kalimantan was a pilot province for REDD+ in Indonesia. Since August 2010, this initiative has aimed to establish provincial wide REDD+ safeguards by employing the REDD+ Social and Environmental Standards (SES) process.

----

[6] Singh & Bhagwat, 2013
[7] http://depts.washington.edu/cgfs/ifsp/Maps.html

Map 2 - Indonesian Islands[8]

UNODC is the custodian of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and United Nations Convention on Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC). It also has extensive experience assisting countries in combating corruption and anti-money laundering. These attributes give UNODC a comparative advantage in focusing on law enforcement-related issues of forest crimes. UNODC has extensive experience in Indonesia through the first phase of the project but also through other projects working with KPK, SC and INP over the last 6 years.

This is a final, independent project evaluation conducted as the Project reached its closure on the 29th July 2016 and as envisaged in the project document. It covers the geographic jurisdiction of Indonesia with a special focus on the three project target areas: Keerom District (Papua), Raja Ampat District (West Papua) and Kapuas District (Central Kalimantan). The evaluation was conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as design, partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lessons learned. This external evaluation is also in line with the UNODC Evaluation Policy, norms and standards. The evaluation seeks to provide accountability to all stakeholders by determining whether the project objectives were met or not, assess the utilization of resources, identify areas for improvement and to learn lessons for executing the next phase of the project as well as formulate a strategy after the life of the project. The outcome of the evaluation will be shared with Core Learning Partners (CLPs) to the project and the final report will be published on the IEU website[9].

_____

[8] http://hotpot.se/maps-oceania-pacific_ocean.htm

[9] Will be available here: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/independent-project-evaluations.html

Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation report is constructed under the following methodological approach. Initially for the Inception Report a desk review of Project documentation was completed. From this any gaps that existed in the information required to fulfil the Terms of Reference (ToR) requirements were identified and a small number of additional questions were added to the ToR. The evaluation recognised the need to gender balance the evaluation approach and as a result an additional question on gender issues was added to the data collection plan. Subsequently four data collection instruments were developed and deployed. These were;

1. Semi-Structured Interviews. These interviews captured the feedback and voices of all stakeholder groups that were involved in or impacted by the Project. The majority of the interviews were face-to-face but where that proved impractical to achieve further interviews were conducted by telephone. The interviews introduced a quantitative as well as qualitative approach as some standard, Likert scale questions were asked in the areas of impact and sustainability from which some inferences based upon statistical analysis could be drawn.

2. MSC narration analysis. The theory and use of MSC narration is a well-documented and researched approach to evaluating and monitoring change projects. It is particularly useful in the evaluation of outcomes and impact and does not rely on the identification and monitoring of indicators. It is a systematic collection and then analysis of significant changes over a defined period of time. It allows interviewee respondents to answer an open-ended question in a way which highlights their own personal understanding and appreciation of the project / programme.

The MSC question used for this evaluation was:

- What is the most significant change you have seen as a direct result of this UNODC Project?

3. Field visit study. Purposeful sampling as detailed below identified geographical areas and thematic elements of the Project that this evaluation used as a focus for eliciting some of the details behind the implementation of the Project. A field study visit assisted in this task. It was of particular use when considering the majority of the ToR questions on 'Efficiency', 'Effectiveness' and 'Lessons learned'.

The key sources of information were drawn from the desk review material, UNODC staff and the core learning partners including:

- Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF)
- Law Enforcement Agencies (INP, AGO, KPK)
- Financial Intelligence Unit (PPATK)
- Forestry Service Agencies at provincial and district levels
- Norwegian Embassy in Jakarta

4. Two short case studies were identified, one from the desk review material and one from the field visit and formed the basis for the identification of the drivers for positive change within the Project activities.

This evaluation used purposeful sampling to obtain an accurate representation of the universe of which the Project consists. This informed all of the data collection instruments including face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews and subsequent emailed follow-up questions.

The five main stakeholder groups within this evaluation that were sampled to ensure a cross section of multiple source data was received were;

a) Recipients of UNODC/INDA02 Project assistance
b) State beneficiaries of UNODC/INDA02 Project assistance
c) Donor
d) External partners
e) Internal (UNODC) partners

In total there were 23 interviews with 20 male and 3 female interviewees.

These groups were identified through the Desk Review phase of the evaluation and during the field visit. The data collection instruments noted were used to gather information from these five stakeholder groups. All groups were reached through face-to-face or telephone semi-structured interviews of key individuals within each stakeholder group and – where necessary – an emailed questionnaire to those key stakeholders unable to be interviewed.

The field visit was selected through purposeful sampling based on the following criteria:

a) Geographic scope: Indonesia with special focus on the three project target areas of Keerom District (Papua), Raja Ampat District (West Papua) and Kapuas District (Central Kalimantan).
b) Donor base: representing the donor to the project.

Through the use of these data collection instruments enough appropriate information was generated to complete the evaluation as per the ToR. The Likert Scale questions in the semi-structured interviews, the results from subsequent emailed questions and certain aspects of both the desk review material and the case studies supplied the quantitative data. The semi-structured interviews, the MSC narration analysis and specific aspects of both the desk review material and the case studies supplied the qualitative data. By applying this mixed, primary and secondary, multi-sourced data against the ToR questions appropriate triangulation of data was achieved.

There were no major limitations in connection with this evaluation however it was conducted by only one evaluator which can lead to sub-conscious and unintentional bias. The methodology was designed to minimise these biases and the support received from the review process of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of UNODC further helped mitigate those bias risks. Additionally – due to illness – the evaluator was unable to visit Western Papua during the field visit however it was still possible to conduct telephone interviews with the appropriate individuals.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Relevance

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) INDA02 Project on Strengthening Criminal Justice responses on Forest Crimes to Support Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) Implementation in Indonesia (known hereafter as 'the Project') is part of UNODC's Country Programme (CP) for Indonesia - Sub-Programme 1: Illicit Trafficking and Transnational Organised Crime, Outcome 1.4 on Wildlife and forest crimes. The CP states UNODC's work in Indonesia will be centred on the collective action of the UN family. UNODC seeks to deliver as "one" UN, and aims to ensure coherence, complementing the work of other UN agencies. The priorities of the UNPDF for Indonesia 2011-2015, which was jointly agreed to by the Indonesian Government and the UN in Indonesia, has therefore guided the development of the Programme. The CP supports the following outcomes of the UNPDF: (i) social services, (ii) sustainable livelihoods, (iii) governance and (iv) climate change and the environment. The scope of inter-UN partnerships aims to strengthen and cultivate new programme and geographical convergence, in line with the United Nations Partnership for Development Framework (UNPDF) principles. As part of the one UN response, UNODC looks to work with other UN agencies to extend support to the REDD+ task Force of the GOI under a multi-donor trust fund environment.[10]

Among the six key issues of good governance recommended by the UN-REDD Programme (2013), law enforcement appears to be crucial and critical for the success of REDD+ implementation in Indonesia. Furthermore, it is one of the approaches to achieve the vision of sustainable management of natural forests and peat lands through an effective governance system by improving laws and regulations and strengthening law enforcement.[11] Given UNODCs mandate there is a role for the organisation in its (continuing) involvement in anchoring its work to REDD+ implementation.

The initial design of the Project was informed by the results from the previous project. The effort made by UNODC in Indonesia in the first phase of the 2010 – 2013 Project to highlight and educate key members of state institutions seems to have paid some dividend. There is indication that they became more fully engaged with the 2014 – 2016 Project. The Project Document states "*During the past few years the Indonesian Government has begun to publicly acknowledge the organized forest crime as one among other main causes of the degradation and the deforestation problem in Indonesia. On illegal activities that linkage with corruption, strong law enforcement measures particularly on illegal logging are the top priority of the Indonesian National Police, along with the Ministry of Forestry and related stakeholders*"[12]. This is supported by a statement made by Mr. Djohan Utama, Director, Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) during a

_____

[10] Country Programme Indonesia 2012 – 2015 p.13
[11] INDA02 Project Document 2013 p.5
[12] INDA02 Project Document 2013 p.9

steering committee meeting in April 2015 who expressed a wish for an increased cooperation with UNODC saying that he hoped UNODC can facilitate trainings etc. in order to increase expertise.

The design of the Project is – naturally – influenced by the size of donor contribution. This Project is funded by one donor, Norway, who pledged USD $ 1,000,000 over what was initially going to be a 20 month Project running from 1st December 2013 to 31st July 2015. This Evaluation Report (ER) believes that, at its inception, the Project set itself slightly ambitious goals to achieve with the resources they had available, specifically the range of forest crime types being tackled. The subsequent need for no cost extensions are examined later in this ER.

The Project's main **objective** is to ensure "*REDD+ Implementation in 3 districts in 3 hot-spot provinces in Indonesia strengthened through effective criminal justice responses on forest crime*".[13] The **outcome** from this objective is defined as "*Crime associated with forest and wildlife, namely illegal logging, encroachment and forest fires identified and acted on in Keerum district (Papua), Raja Ampat district (West Papua) and Kapuas district (Central Kalimantan)*".[14]

The five **outputs** are;

1. Reviewed policies, laws, decrees and with recommendations for improved criminal justice responses according to international standards;
2. Database on forest crime (illegal logging, illegal encroachment, forest fires) associated with Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) of REDD+ implementation improved;
3. Capacity of law enforcement agencies and the judiciary (including Forest Rangers) in Keerom District – near the border of Papua New Guinea (Papua), Raja Ampat District (West Papua) and Kapuas District (Central Kalimantan) strengthened;
4. A zero burning policy including measures on Monitoring, reporting and Verification on illegal logging, illegal encroachment and forest fires to promote cooperation between responsible agencies within and across borders with Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei have been proposed to the responsible agencies;
5. Involvement of Community groups and NGOs/CSOs in supporting compliance of legislation, practices and programmes to prevent forest crimes.

The Project sits comfortably within the CP through the logical framework and associated indicators, outputs and outcomes and takes the majority of its strategic direction from the CP under Sub-Programme 1. Within the logical framework indicators have been developed to monitor progress and subsequent Project reporting has measured the majority of those indicators. The indicators remained relatively consistent throughout the duration of the Project although some minor changes were made during the June 2015 project revision. These changes appear logical and justified. The actions detailed in the logical framework that support the outputs appear relevant to achieving the desired outputs however this ER has reservations over some of the indicators used and this is examined under the 'Impact' section.

As noted the Project sits well within the CP however the interaction between the Project and the Global Programme (GP) for Combating Wildlife and Forest Crime (WLFC) is less clear. The GP states that "*When planning implementation of activities, close liaison will be made with UNODC Country and Regional Offices to ensure appropriate support for the design and delivery of WLFC*

––––––––––

[13] INDA02 Project Document p16
[14] INDA02 Project Document p16

6

projects and activities. UNODC will also coordinate its efforts with various multilateral initiatives such as REDD+, UN-REDD, FLEGT and Wildlife Enforcement Networks".[15] The Project does have its single point of contact in UNODC Regional Office (RO) in Bangkok for WLFC matters. However there is no express evidence of how the Project and the GP have attempted to either coordinate efforts on areas where there relative mandates cross or how to exploit each other's skills and experiences.

UNODC itself identified its relevance from baseline data that drew upon the first phase of the Project and other reporting e.g. UNODC's 2013 'Transnational Organized Crime in East Asia and the Pacific: A Threat Assessment' report. The ER is satisfied that the need (and relevance) of the Project had been soundly researched and was justified. And the relevance of the Project does not appear to be in doubt from the perspective of the international donor community with Norway willing to fund the Project with a budget of US $1,000,000.

This evaluation has noted from various stakeholder interviews that one particular area of relevance for future activities could be tackling the issue of forest fires. Time and again during both face-to-face and telephone interviews this issue was raised as one of concern and of possible future intervention by UNODC. However this statement must be balanced against other data, again from stakeholder interviews with individuals from the same agencies and organisations that stated illegal logging is, and should continue to be, the focus of current and future UNODC work. This conflict of opinion demonstrates the difficulty UNODC faces when attempting to ensure stakeholder and beneficiary opinion and desires are catered for within UNODC support.

The Project itself does recognise the importance of forest fires and in its 'End of assignment report' on the Indonesia Country Programme (CP) publication it notes that forest fires form the second largest crime type after illegal logging in Central Kalimantan from November 2014 to November 2015[16] . Additionally some UNODC Project work has been interrupted due to 'Haze' caused by forest fires. Forest fires are also used to assist in the production of palm oil and had a detrimental effect on the health of many Indonesian nationals caught in the environment of these fires. It is important, therefore, for any new Project to carefully assess the role it should take in tackling what is clearly an issue of concern for many people. Other actors and agencies are also involved in these areas so it is incumbent that UNODC in its new Project makes clear what steps (if any) it is willing to take in this area, with whom it will be interfacing and the justification for its course of action.

This evaluation does not suggest that UNODC should automatically include a forest fire element to its work, however there may be value in considering how it could be addressed in any subsequent rewrite of their training material in any future Project. Any future Project should continue to build on the work already invested in countering illegal logging as that is still recognised by the overwhelming majority of all stakeholders that contributed to this evaluation report and through documentary evidence as a key issue. The Project (and its successor assuming it maintains a major illegal logging element) will remain relevant.

_____

[15] Global Programme for combatting wildlife and forest crime (WLFC) p.11
[16] p.10

It is also worth noting here that some stakeholders suggested UNODC Project should expand their activities into additional areas of illegal activity that encroach upon the forest. The suggestion was that the Project should take a greater interest in the issuance and control of licences for these types of activities. Interviews with forest rangers themselves highlighted the fact that they were not confident when examining licences as to whether they were genuine or not.

There is no evidence to support a change in the geographical scope or focus of the Project. Although many stakeholders would wish to see the Project expand into other areas (there appears to be an appetite for further expansion of the Projects presence in Papua) and there is doubtless a need for it in other parts of Indonesia. However, the Project appears to have reached the limit of what can be achieved with the resources at its disposal and it is highly probable this evaluation has concerns that there are insufficient resources to make this expansion viable. Furthermore the baseline study completed in 2013 still – prima facie – appears valid and the three main geographical areas that the Project tackles are still relevant to date.

The challenge, therefore, for any new Project is to assess what can be achieved from the funds that are available. Naturally an expansion of the three existing areas into new districts and covering additional crime areas would be laudable. However the new Project may be spreading its resources too thinly and the effective work undertaken to date could be undermined. This aspect is also covered within the 'Sustainability' section of this report.

Efficiency

Project implementation was delayed for approximately a year. It was originally planned to end 31 July 2015 but it was extended at no cost for five months until 31 December 2015 and again for another three months until 31 March 2016, and finally for another four months until 29 July 2016. This delay was, in large part, caused by certain inefficiencies. Some of these were partially within the Project, some within the wider control of UNODC (although not directly by the Project) and others that fell outside the influence of both the Project and UNODC.

One of the main challenges responsible for delays in implementation was the difficulty in recruiting suitable and qualified national Project Associates to be based in Jakarta and in sub-national project target areas. The project was originally managed by three national Project Associates however one of them left in February 2015 and no suitable candidate was immediately available to fill the position. Indeed the position wasn't filled for over nine months. With the long-term loss of a Project Associate the Project management was restructured by assigning the two remaining Project Associates to handle day-to-day planning and implementation of project activities while the UNODC Country Manager took on a strengthened supervisory role and provided strategic guidance. This loss of one key staff member and the difficulties in replacing them and recruiting for other positions resulted in a slow-down of delivery and had a negative impact upon the efficiency of the Project. The general length of time it takes UNODC to recruit personnel was cited as a weakness in UNODC operation that impacts upon the Office's ability to deliver efficiently in the field. This was noted not only by UNODC staff but by external stakeholders.

Another – what might be termed 'internal' – reason for a reduction in efficiency could be attributed to the transition of the UN Secretariat-wide Umoja Enterprise Resource Planning System (SAP) and associated limited ability to conduct business transactions in the fourth quarter

of 2015 as well as January 2016. The Project team cannot be held accountable for the delays caused by the implementation of Umoja. However it is assessed the Project team did its best to inform and explain to its stakeholders why this changeover was causing delay. In general the Project stakeholder groups understood and sympathised with the Project team but the delays still caused some frustration and disappointment at the broader UNODC and UN. Although falling directly outside the ToR of this evaluation it is worth noting that if any such similar future enterprise which may impact so fully upon a Project is implemented greater effort should be invested by UNODC as a whole to inform all stakeholders internally and externally before and during implementation of the programme. It has to be highlighted at this juncture that the Regional Office (RO) in Bangkok gave excellent support to the country office and the Project at this difficult time and that, in general, the working relationship between the Project and the RO is good.

However the greatest challenge to efficiency did not come from any internal problems such as recruitment or system changes. The biggest factor in the reduction of Project efficiency was external with the merging of the Ministry of Forestry with the Ministry of Environment in January 2015. This resulted in a wholesale change of staff and staff roles within the newly merged agencies and made identifying appropriate focal points at a national and, more specifically, sub-national project target areas difficult. The Project team had identified a similar type of risk in their risk register 'High staff rotation in government agencies impedes programme implementation' which they assessed as 'medium' likelihood and 'medium' impact with the risk mitigation strategy to 'request government counterpart to appoint focal persons from different divisions and operational levels'. In practice it is virtually impossible to predict all risks that may impact upon the Project. What is important is not to try and predict all future risks but to have processes in place to react to whatever situation has developed. In this instance the Project had, through its risk management procedure, identified that the key beneficiary personnel required to keep the Project running efficiently were the divisional and operational counterparts. This knowledge allowed the Project to focus on attempting to identify those new focal points as quickly as possible after the merger of the two agencies. So although the merger of the agencies had a large impact upon the efficiency of the Project this evaluation is of the opinion that the Project had done as much as was reasonably possible to identify and manage that risk.

Having noted all of the above difficulties with regard to efficiency this evaluation would like to stress that the Project team itself and the translation of their resources into outputs was efficient. The list of achievements as measured by number of training courses, workshops and meetings delivered is substantial given the relatively small budget and the difficult geographical environment in which they operate. This evaluation was particularly impressed at the ability of the Project to deliver training in relatively remote localities in an efficient manner.

A very shortened list of activities is given in the 'Effectiveness' section below but a brief summation of all activities shows 4 different workshops on topics such as biodiversity, anti-corruption and anti-money laundering over a total of 8 days with a total of 134 participants. There were 13 different training sessions covering many areas including community patrolling, crime scene management, intelligence gathering, anti-money laundering, informant handling and anti-corruption over a total of 65 days with a total of 309 participants. Additionally there have been meetings and focus groups primarily in connection with outputs 1 and 2. These led to the application of the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit with the full support of the Project which encouraged the furtherance of agreements on how information on wildlife crime could be managed and exchanged between appropriate agencies.

Given the challenges the Project faced, in particular during 2015, the list of activities undertaken demonstrates a Project run as efficiently as could be expected under the circumstances. Additionally the response to those challenges suggests a local country office team that is itself flexible and efficient.

Effectiveness

Given the relatively modest budget of the Project and the issues already noted above under 'efficiency' the evaluation report is gratified to note that much of the output from the Project has been effectively delivered. This – of course – is not the same as 'Impact' which is discussed later in the report and there now follows a shortened list of some of the activities that were delivered.

The Project gave its full assistance to an assessment of laws and regulations related to wildlife and forest crime in Indonesia based on the 'Toolkit'. The assessment report was finalised in June 2015 and includes a number of recommendations for legal revisions such as a need to strengthen criminal provisions towards corporations and to adjust the amount of criminal fines on forest and wildlife crime. The assessment will serve as a basis for dialogue with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) on the planned 2016 revisions of Act No. 5/1990 on Conservation of Living Resources and their Ecosystem and Act Number 41/1999 on Forestry.

In addition, UNODC supported a workshop on 15 June 2015 in Jakarta to discuss and propose recommendations for a new presidential instruction on illegal logging, land tenure, and the sustainability of Indonesian flora and fauna. The workshop was organised in cooperation with MoEF and was attended by 177 officers (157 male, 20 female) from MoEF, the Centre for Conservation of Natural Resources (BKSDA), the National Parks, KPK, PPATK, AGO, Supreme Court, media, and NGOs. Following the workshop discussions, the participants agreed on a number of recommendations for a new presidential instruction including on wildlife and forest crime.

UNODC sponsored two delegates from MoEF to attend the 10th Meeting of ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN) in Brunei, Darussalam on 5-6 May 2015. At the meeting MoEF delegates presented new initiatives related to law enforcement on illegal wildlife in Indonesia including the development of MoUs at national and international levels.

A total of 99 law enforcement officers (93 male, 6 female) were trained in 2015 as part of the implementation of this programme. In addition, 203 law enforcement officers[17] attended other UNODC supported workshops on law enforcement agencies' response to forest crime.

On 12-16 January 2015, UNODC organised an integrated training in Jakarta for judges, prosecutors and investigators who were all male on the handling of biodiversity cases in cooperation with the US Embassy. The objective of the training was to strengthen the ability of judges, prosecutors and investigators to successfully identify strategies for bringing cases to justice based on a range of legal actions instead of relying merely on environmental laws which may be more difficult to prove. A total of 6 prosecutors and judges (all male) were

_____

[17] No gender specific breakdown available in Annual Progress Report 2015 of the project.

sponsored by UNODC to travel from the three project target areas (Papua, West Papua and Central Kalimantan) to attend the workshop.

On 22-28 June 2015 UNODC organised training in Bogor on evidence gathering and crime scene investigation for law enforcement officers. A total of 42 officers (38 males, 4 females) participated from BKSDA, the national parks, provincial and district forestry service agencies, district police offices, and the police school. The training received positive feedback from the participants and UNODC was requested to replicate the training in other districts and to involve a broader group of stakeholders including Customs and the military as part of the Government's multi-door approach to criminal justice in the forest sector.

These activities have resulted in the Project, in general, meeting four of the five outputs it strived to achieve during its lifetime. There should be a short caveat placed on this statement however as the Project did focus on illegal logging at the expense of encroachment and forest fires. The evidence shows that it was the correct decision to make given the relatively small amount of resources available to the Project but as a result far less progress on those specific areas of encroachment and forest fires were achieved.

The only output where the Project struggled unduly was output No.2 "*Database on forest crime (illegal logging, illegal encroachment, forest fires) associated with Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) of REDD+ implementation improved*". The development of the database proved difficult to achieve due to a lack of commitment by MoEF which was the central authority responsible for the compilation and standardisation of forest crime data from law enforcement institutions at district, province and national level. When this project was designed in 2013 the Ministry of Forestry (which was the main ministerial project counterpart at the time) expressed their support and commitment to the development of a centralised database under the Ministry and it was agreed to include the database's development in the project log frame as one of five envisaged outputs. However, after the Ministry of Forestry was restructured and merged with the Ministry of Environment in January 2015 the interest of the Ministry decreased and no further commitment for the databases' development has been demonstrated.

It is to the Project's credit that after struggling with these difficulties it altered its focus toward other modalities for data sharing, particularly at the sub-national levels. In April and May 2015, UNODC organised focus group discussions in Papua and Central Kalimantan to improve inter-agency communication and cooperation at local level. The existing intelligence and information sharing mechanism known as "Regional Intelligence Community" (KOMINDA) was found to be an appropriate platform for inter-agency data sharing. However even this 'solution' has proved challenging to implement. The importance of effective information exchange is understood, however the difficulties encountered by the Project in this area are noted. Any future Project should have a robust consultation mechanism in place to help decide the likelihood of being able to attain effective information sharing platforms / protocols that provide the best use of UNODCs Project resources.

The basis of the Project relies upon capacity building primarily (though not exclusively) through training programmes and workshops. Overall the way in which the Project has managed this to ensure those training programmes and workshops are as effective as possible has been fully satisfactory. The Project has conducted systemic reviews and evaluations of the training, the content, the skills, abilities and suitability of the trainers and has made adjustments where necessary. This has helped to ensure these workshops and training programmes continue to

achieve high satisfaction ratings from the training participants and other stakeholders. Any new Project should ensure this approach continues and medium to long term Monitoring and Evaluation of training results is incorporated as standard. It is incumbent upon this evaluation to highlight that the Project appears to have found a small and talented pool of trainers.

A sizeable minority of stakeholders – many of whom were well placed to make this observation – noted that to improve effectiveness of the training it may be worthwhile to try and engaged more with local community leaders and chiefs. They are often the individuals who will be able to carry the message to the wider community and be in a position to alter attitudes and behaviours of the indigenous population. Any new Project should carefully consider how it may best engage and involve those key individuals.

The relative diversity of the training can be viewed as both a potential strength and weakness. As noted earlier the various workshops and training sessions have covered a wide number of topic areas. All of the topic areas covered are of relevance however there is a potential danger that in trying to cover everything that an officer needs to tackle forest crime effectively a certain depth required in key areas will be missed. It should be noted that the Project has identified through its own efforts and from stakeholder feedback that follow-up or 'refresher' training is important and has been conducted. Any new Project should give close consideration to reducing the number of 'topic areas' covered by the Project concentrating on those it deems to be of particular importance. From the desk review material and subsequent data collection through face-to-face and telephone interviews and the case studies it would appear that subject areas such as anti-corruption and anti-money laundering within the agreed scope of the new Project (i.e. illegal logging with or without forest fires etc.) may be areas which could form a focus for future workshops and training.

Finally it should be noted that some of the measures the Project uses to determine the effectiveness and success of the Project are the number of arrests and prosecutions for forest crimes. If any new Project wishes to maintain this as an ultimate measure of success greater emphasis should be placed on capacity building for the entire justice system including prosecutors and judges. Lessons learned from other UNODC Programmes and Projects (e.g. Global Maritime Crime Programme) suggest that UNODC taking ownership of key strands of the criminal justice sector to better facilitate the entire process of investigation, arrest and prosecution of perpetrators in a particular crime area can work.

Impact

The area of measuring impact in a capacity building Project is extremely difficult. To its credit this Project has built in a Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) process in particular around the delivery of its training programmes. Although not implemented from the start of the Project, every training course has pre and post training questionnaires designed to extract information from which the Project can measure change in knowledge of participants. This should be further extended to monitor the medium and longer term change over time.

For example on 22-28 June 2015 UNODC organised training in Bogor on evidence gathering and crime scene investigation for law enforcement officers. A total of 42 officers (38 males, 4 females) participated from BKSDA, the national parks, provincial and district forestry service agencies, district police offices, and the police school. The training received positive feedback from the participants and UNODC was requested to replicate the training in other districts and to

involve a broader group of stakeholders including Customs and the military as part of the Government's multi-door approach to criminal justice in the forest sector.

Pre- and post-tests showed that the participants' knowledge was enhanced on intelligence based approaches to detection and investigation of forest crime, community policing for the detection of illegal logging, informant handling, crime scene investigation, evidence gathering on forest crime, use of GPS, and the drafting of reports on forest crimes. The class average prior to the training was 14% which increased to 45% in post training evaluations.

The M and E process also looks to identify where improvements in the training itself can be made. For example the three 'Training on Forest Crime Investigation through Anti-Corruption and Anti-Money Laundering Approach' courses that were conducted in Palangka Raya, Central Kalimantan; Jayapura, Papua and Sorong, West Papua were evaluated and certain conclusions and recommendations were drawn from those to inform future courses e.g. 'different level of knowledge of participants needs to be balanced in future courses'. This is partially corroborated through the interviews for this evaluation where more than one recipient of UNODC training stated that it was important to get the right people on the courses. A particularly noteworthy quote from one of these interviews was "with the right people you will get the best impact".

Additionally, and most impressively this reporting is also used to help inform how the Project may make a better impact in the core objective of the Project to tackle forest crime. The same evaluation report as noted in the paragraph above also stated in its 'follow up actions' to '[ensure the involvement of] the community as part of detection for any kind of suspicious activities in forest area that can be categorised as forest crimes'. This focus on M and E and the Project's use of it in an attempt to improve effectiveness and impact is well placed and makes for a good general approach. It is noted that the Project employed an expert from mid-2015 onward to assist UNODC in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the Project as well as the preparation of Project progress reports to donors and UNODC HQ. The Project monitoring system also links into the Country Programme for Indonesia through the efforts of a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer whose primary responsibility was to ensure that project (and overall programme) monitoring systems were in place and used to generate useful results-based information as well as to support all the evaluation activities.[18]

However, whilst this M and E approach obviously brings benefit to the Project it is still difficult to assess the actual impact of the Project. Again the Project has attempted to measure this impact through a small number of quantitative indicators. These include for example the number of officers trained, the number of convicted cases of illegal logging, the number of reported cases of illegal logging or illegal encroachment etc. Whilst these may give a very general overview of the current situation they are not strictly indicative of the impact of the training since so many other factors well outside the control of the Project or UNODC as a whole will contribute to whether a successful prosecution for illegal logging is achieved. For example although reports of cases of illegal logging and encroachment were received in 2013 and 2014 none of these cases were investigated as neither the district forestry service agency nor the district police had any budget to carry out investigations. Thus it could be argued that UNODC training was effective since cases of illegal logging were received but it could also be argued that UNODC training was ineffective since none of the cases were investigated and – therefore – no convictions.

––––––––––

[18] Country Programme – Indonesia 2012 – 2015 p.33

There are two case studies / examples which demonstrate quite clearly the impact of the training. One identifiable example of success which is illustrated by the recent conviction of a Police Officer from Raja Ampat who was sentenced by the Supreme Court to 15 years imprisonment for money laundering linked to illegal logging and fuel smuggling. After attending a UNODC training for forest rangers a participant gained the knowledge and confidence to report his suspicions to the appropriate authorities. The case was subsequently investigated by the Indonesian Financial Transactions Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK) and INP who found transactions of over IDR 1 trillion (US$ 102 million) on the Police Officer's private bank account between 2007 and 2012 with links to illegal logging and fuel smuggling.

In another example (which is still on-going and therefore this evaluation report does not wish to disclose specific details) a similar story is unfolding. Again this started with a UNODC training participant gaining the knowledge and confidence to raise his concerns about potential bribery and corruption to facilitate forest crime.

There were impressive results from the Likert Scale question which asked all interviewees about their assessment of the impact of the Project. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being very poor and 7 being excellent the overall score was averaged at a fraction above 5 which is an impressive result. These examples and results from the questions asked of stakeholders more than figures about arrests, convictions, number of cases identified etc. are far better indicators of the success of the Project's activities. It will be an onerous but vital task of any new Project to identify the best indicators of Project activity success **and** to assess if those activities lead to the achievement of the overall objective(s) of the Project.

With this in mind the latest logical framework of the Project and its list of indicators and means of verification demonstrates a basic grasp of what is required to properly measure impact. However any new Project will have to dedicate far greater intellectual resources and expertise into developing a log-frame that contains more relevant indicators through measurable means of verification that are tied to assessing outcomes and their impact on objectives.

Overall the evaluation is satisfied with the impact the training element of the Project has achieved. In addition to capacity building through training there is the impact of the application of the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit and the recommendations that have come from this work. A substantial amount of Project resources was invested in this effort and there is evidence from the desk review and interviews for this evaluation that the 'Toolkit' is a valuable resource. It has certainly brought a certain visibility to the Project and UNODC in general to the wider stakeholder community. However it is too early in its lifecycle to determine the impact it has had on the Project's overall objective to ensure "*REDD+ Implementation in 3 districts in 3 hot-spot provinces in Indonesia strengthened through effective criminal justice responses on forest crime*". This evaluation believes there is merit in any new Project ensuring the 'Toolkit' is publicised and applied where appropriate.

Sustainability

The Likert Scale question on sustainability (on a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being very poor and 7 being excellent) within the interview data shows a score of just under 4 i.e. just below average when interviewees were asked how sustainable they believed were the Project outputs. The clearest issue the Project faces with regard to sustainability revolves around the resources of the beneficiaries of the Project based in the outlying districts in which the Project operates. Interview

after interview highlighted the fact that those being trained would welcome the opportunity to put fully into practice all that they had learned however a lack of resources meant that much could not be achieved. One example of the scarcity of resources stated that there should be one officer per 5,000 hectares of forest. In the areas covered by the Project the average is one officer per 100,000 hectares. The forest rangers lack the necessary transport and communication equipment to ease their jobs and as previously noted in this report a lack of resources has seen reported cases of forest crime not investigated. This evaluation could easily list twenty different requests made to the evaluator from forest rangers and other training beneficiaries for what many would consider basic requirements to conduct effective law enforcement investigations. The Project itself cannot hope to solve these resource issues by itself although it has provided some equipment to officers in the field which has been gratefully received.

Recognising these resource issues – and the almost 100% certainty that they will not be anywhere near fully solved during the lifetime of any new Project – it is critical that the Project focuses its capacity building work in areas which can provide the biggest dividend given this lack of resource. Thus training courses should be tailored to ensure that participants can actually apply the learning with the resources they have available. It is interesting to note that two of the notable successes of the training to date as detailed in the 'Impact' section relied not on what the officers could physically apply 'in the field' but more on building their confidence and showing them the process through which they could use their existing (and new) knowledge in an effective manner.

Another area which was raised as particularly important when attempting to build sustainability into UNODC Project work was the involvement of the local community. The participants to the training were fully appreciative of the knowledge they were receiving and of the knowledge of those training them. However they felt that there should be greater support from the Project to assist them in engaging with the local community, in particular the community leaders and elders. This, they believed, could help ensure the training would have a longer-term and more lasting impact.

Additionally the interviews identified a demand for so-called 'refresher' and / or 'update' training. The argument was put forward that as officers leave to perform other duties they take that knowledge and training with them. Yet information received suggested that the majority of officers trained by UNODC under this Project do **not** move on to other jobs or out of the district. However trends and modus operandi in forest crime do change over time and from that perspective it may be useful to have those refresher and updated training courses.

There may also be value in shorter 'update' training even if it is simply to reinforce that those officers previously trained have not been 'forgotten about' by the Project. It may also present an opportunity to provide any newly developed training based on the M and E feedback from previous courses and the new Project's (re)evaluation of what type of training delivers the greatest benefit.

From the Project's sustainability perspective the greatest risk is that it relies solely on the largesse of one donor. Although that donor is likely to continue to support the Project the risk to the Project of this over reliance is clear. This evaluation would strongly recommend that the new Project looks broaden its donor base.

Partnerships and cooperation

Within this area of partnership and cooperation the Project must look toward how it deals with these issues from both an internal (UNODC / UN) perspective and with key external stakeholders. At a regional and global scale, UNODC is engaged in the combat of forest crime in a number of countries including neighbouring countries to Indonesia, e.g. Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. The UNODC Indonesia Office must maintain close contact with other UNODC colleagues who are implementing forest crime activities to ensure that lessons learned and best practices will be considered in the planning of activities in Indonesia.

There are a number of Global Programmes within UNODC where this evaluation would like to see the Project more fully interact; in particular the GPs on Anti-Corruption, Anti-Money Laundering and Wildlife and Forest Crime. The Project has itself already recognised the importance of corruption and money laundering in forest crime. It therefore makes perfect sense to use the expertise that lies within the wider UNODC in these areas to best effect. The Project certainly benefits from a key staff member well versed in anti-corruption issues but should the Project lose that staff member for whatever reason a large part of anti-corruption knowledge could be lost. There needs to be a systematic relationship built between the Indonesian Country Office, the Regional Office in Bangkok and HQs between the relevant GPS to ensure best practice is deployed, thematic and Project objectives are coherent and duplication is avoided. Once again this evaluation recognises the good working relationship between the Country Office and the Regional Office and the care taken to ensure the objectives of the Project fit within the Country and regional Programmes. It is less clear how the interface between the Project and the HQ based GPs works in practice and it appears to be on a relatively ad-hoc basis.

Additionally the Project may have to engage with other arms of the larger UN family, in particular when it comes to Human Rights and Gender issues. This will be further explained in the following section of this report.

The Project has managed its external partnership and cooperation well given the difficulties it has faced with its key partners the Ministry of Forestry merging with the Ministry of Environment. The difficulties this presented to the Project have been previously covered and it is to the credit of the Project that they have managed to re-establish a 'new' working relationship with the MoEF in what was a difficult and fluid time.

It is also evident that the Project has taken care to manage its relationship with its sole donor very well. Keeping them informed of progress and difficulties and being ready to listen to the donors thoughts and wishes. The evaluation report would strike one small note of caution here and highlight the fact that the Project only has one donor and that could leave itself open to having the Project's agenda completely donor driven. The Project must take care to fully engage with all stakeholders to ensure it delivers what an objective appraisal of the situation suggests. There was a little disquiet expressed by some stakeholders that their wishes had not been given great enough credence when the Project was designed, nor during its subsequent implementation. These comments were not strong or consistent enough to cause great concern for this evaluation however they should act as a 'warning bell' for the design of any future Project.

The Project is very aware of the other actors within this field and has cooperated where necessary with those actors. These include agencies such as the Centre for Conservation of Natural Resources (BKSDA), the National Parks, the Supreme Courts the Ministry of Environment and

Forestry, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Indonesian National Police (INP), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK), Customs, the Attorney-General's Office, Provincial and District governments, the local community and Civil Society and Non-Governmental Organisations.

Some of these it engages at a local level when, for example, delivering training in the field. Or at a district and provincial level when, for example, establishing inter-agency cooperation on forest crimes in Papua Province. Or at a national level when, for example, assisting in pushing forward information sharing processes e.g. a local initiative establishing inter-agency cooperation in applying the 'Toolkit'. The evaluation has no overriding concerns that any new Project will not be able to build on the external cooperation relationships already in place.

Looking forward a major potential external partner could be The Asia Foundation which is implementing the SETAPAK programme which is a DFID-funded initiative focused on improving forest and land governance in selected target areas. The SETAPAK programme is focusing on forest and land governance including components on law enforcement and anti-corruption initiatives. It is crucial therefore that UNODC coordinates and maintains a close dialogue with The Asia Foundation during any new Project implementation to avoid overlaps and promote synergies between the two programmes.

Human Rights and Gender

Regarding Human Rights the Project notes "*Human Rights issues will be mainstreamed into all training activities and specific training on Human Right issues will be provided*[19]". The interviews with UNODC staff have highlighted that they are aware of the need for Human Rights (HR) to be addressed within Project work but also highlights a lack of HR expertise and specialism in order to make HR mainstreaming effective. This evaluation report could find no evidence of specific training on HR issues provided nor did it uncover any incidental evidence of HR issues being addressed in any systemic fashion. The training courses themselves and the reports upon the training courses made little or no mention of HR issues being dealt with during the training.

The initial Project Document of 2013 also notes that "*UNODC has developed standardized guidelines for the implementation of the HRDDP requirements. The guidelines include conducting background checks of recipients of UNODC assistance in a transparent and accountable manner, in order to ensure that human rights are respected both by the participants and by UNODC*". This evaluation could find no express documentation that due diligence in this area had been conducted.

A key issue in being able to mainstream HR training is to have the knowledge and support of those experts both within the UNODC specifically and the United Nations in general for whom HR training is their area of specialism and expertise. UNODC officers whose specialisms lie in tackling forest crime may not have the necessary expertise or knowledge on how to integrate an effective HR programme into their Project. The Project Management team may not have ready access to that type of expertise within their own Project or Office however and they should know to whom they should approach in order to obtain that expertise. There needs to be a more 'joined

_____

[19] INDA02 Project Document 2013 p.11

up' approach to integrating HR into any new Project but this cannot be left to the Project Management team alone.

The project document and subsequent project progress reports and revisions reference the need for the Project to pay proper cognisance to both human rights and gender issues. "*The programme seeks to offer equal opportunities to female officers to participate in all activities and training and will gather gender disaggregated data in all cases*[20]". The reporting from the Project demonstrates they have collected disaggregated gender data and that this aspect is systemic within the Project. To date approximately 18% of all participants on Project training courses and workshops have been female. Subsequent Project Document reviews also highlight that the Project does recognise the importance of gender issues '*Although the project does not specifically cover gender issues, it promotes and takes into account gender mainstreaming aspects wherever applicable. Gender perspective will be considered, including by ensuring, to the maximum extent possible, equal gender representation among participants and resource persons'.*[21]

As with the HR issue this evaluation found little evidence of any systemic approach to gender integration; mirroring the HR difficulties there is a need for specialist help. UNODC itself recognises these difficulties. In its guidance note for UNODC staff 'Gender Mainstreaming in the work of UNODC' it states "*This Note is designed for non-gender specialists. While it can seem daunting and looking at gender roles, responsibilities and inequalities seems complicated, there are basic steps that all staff can do that does not require special expertise. This Note is meant to be practical and make the concept and practice of gender mainstreaming accessible to UNODC staff and to clarify when to call in specialist help*"[22]. This evaluation is of the opinion that given the relatively small Project Team and resources available to the Project that the specialist assistance offered in the Guidance Note should be exercised for any subsequent Project. Prior to this approach the new Project should examine closely the 'Gender Mainstreaming in the work of UNODC' document and determine how much of that can be directly and effectively applied to the new Project. If areas still exist where specialist HQ gender mainstreaming support is required this should be requested.

_____

[20] INDA02 Project Document 2013 p.11
[21] INDA02 Project Revision March 2016
[22] http://www.un.org/womenwatch/directory/docs/UNODC-GuidanceNote-GenderMainstreaming.pdf p.2

III. CONCLUSIONS

Given the relatively small resources available to the Project of US $1m over what was originally a twenty month period the Project has achieved a good deal of success and provided value for money for both the donor and the beneficiaries. This is all the more impressive given the challenges faced by the Project during 2015 when three no cost extensions had to be added to the contract due to circumstances, the majority of which were outside the control of the Project.

The training based capacity building approach has worked due to a number of factors, namely;

- ➢ The skill of the trainers
- ➢ The use of local trainers and expertise where possible
- ➢ The quality of the training product
- ➢ A Monitoring and Evaluation process that focuses on training results
- ➢ The delivery of training in the appropriate local environment

Any future Project should look to continue this approach but consider streamlining the subject areas the training covers by focussing on anti-money laundering and anti-corruption as it's used in the forest crime arena.

The focus on illegal logging for the Project was a sensible and logical approach given it is the largest forest crime. However the issue of forest fires which technically forms part of the Project was not given prominence. With the conclusion of the Project now is a good time to assess the impact of forest crime in the country and determine whether this should form part of any future Project strategy.

The Project made effective use of the resources it had available and concrete results from the training it provided could be seen in two specific examples. In both examples the law enforcement officers had attended UNODC training given by the Project and both were given the knowledge and – crucially – the confidence to use that knowledge to bring to the attention of the appropriate authorities actions that were being taken that constituted forest crime. The Project has also fostered inter-agency cooperation through its attempts to encourage information sharing and has invested in assisting in the application of the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit which has received widespread praise and raised the profile of the Project in particular and UNODC in general.

There is still some progress to be made when it comes to monitoring the success and impact of the Project with some existing indicators not truly reflective of the activities of the Project. It is invalid, for example, to measure the success of the project against number of prosecutions for forest crimes. Yet there is much qualitative evidence from the interviews conducted and some quantitative evidence from the pre and post training of knowledge gained that the training is worthwhile from the participant perspective. And should any new Project go down the road of supporting the entire criminal justice chain in the arrest,

prosecution and conviction of individuals for forest crime then number of convictions, for example, may become a valid indicator.

The lack of resources within the beneficiaries to the Project can have an impact upon the sustainability of the Project's activities. There is little advantage in training officers in crime scene investigation if they don't have enough fuel in their motorbikes to reach the crime scene. The Project has tried to build in some resilience with the beneficiaries by providing some hardware but the Project itself lacks enough resources to make an appreciable difference in this area. This also leads to one are of concern for the Project as it relies for 100% of its funding from one donor. A wider donor base would be advantageous.

The Project works well with its counterparts, in particular at the local level and the engagement of local community leaders and chiefs is good practice that should be extended. It has also identified those external partners with whom to work and has formed a good relationship with the Regional Office in Bangkok. This has helped ensure the Project is well designed and falls within the relevant country and regional programming. The Project needs to more fully engage with the thematic HQ based Global Programmes that impact upon its areas of activity e.g. anti-corruption, money laundering and Wildlife and Forest Crime.

Overall the Project has achieved the majority of its outputs, been well received by the majority of stakeholder groups and the majority of people within those groups. It has a successful template which it should be able to replicate and develop in the future.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Any future Project should continue to include tackling illegal logging as a main priority. This has been shown through the data collection for this evaluation to still be a high priority for many stakeholders; and for most it is still the highest priority.

Any future Project should give close consideration to creating one of the foci within the Project based around the crime of forest fires. The views of all relevant stakeholder groups should be assessed objectively and the decision to include – or not include – the crime of forest fires should be clearly communicated to all parties. It is difficult for the evaluation to provide a definitive answer as to whether or not forest fires should receive greater attention in any new Project since the data collected was conflicting. Some interviewees from the same stakeholder groups had differing opinions on this aspect.

Any future Project should take great care when assessing the impact of geographical expansion of the Project given the resources available. If expansion is to be undertaken either additional resources will have to be found or reductions made in existing Project areas since the Project is fully stretched with respect to resources available to deliver under the existing Project.

The risk register developed by the Project has proved useful. It has helped the Project identify some of the key vulnerabilities in potential Project activity implementation. And with the merger of a key partner with another entity (the two ministries of forestry and environment) the risk register had highlighted the risk of losing key points of contact. This allowed the Project to react in a faster and more efficient manner in its attempts to re-establish key contacts since the risk register noted this was an important facet of the Project. Any new Project should maintain and regularly update the risk register.

Any future Project should have a robust consultation mechanism in place to help decide the likelihood of being able to attain effective information sharing platforms / protocols thus providing best value for UNODC Project resources. The Project has struggled throughout its life to improve and create effective information sharing protocols and platforms. There are so many 'moving parts' in trying to get this achieved and so many of those are outside the direct or indirect influence of the Project.

The focus on capacity building through training and workshops delivered locally with – as far as possible – local trainers and experts should continue. This has proved effective and the two concrete examples of participants trained by UNODC and as a direct result of that training having the strength to stand forward and bring cases connected to forest crime to the attention of the authorities is evidence of the worth of this approach.

Consider refining the training subject areas with a greater focus on anti-corruption and anti-money laundering elements to the training with refresher training as part of the training cycle. At this moment the Project offers a wide range of topic areas in its forest crime training including crime scene management, crime scene investigation, intelligence gathering etc.

Whilst these are all laudable and relevant topic areas there is a danger that the Project message and approach becomes too diverse and diluted. Most commentators and stakeholders within the Project recognise the important roles that corruption and money laundering play as key facilitators in forest crime. Any new Project would do well to consider highlighting and prioritising these for future training.

Include greater cooperation at a local level with community leaders and chiefs by engaging and educating them in UNODC activities and goals demonstrating how that will improve life for the local population. The various interviews with individuals (the forest rangers) working in the field was the necessity to have the support of the local community, guided by their leaders. The Project has recognised the importance of developing support at this very local level and any new Project should continue and enhance this approach.

Greater effort is required to develop a logical framework that uses accurate indicators to measure the impact of the outcomes from the outputs on the overall objective(s) of the Project. As noted within this report many of the current indicators of success do not measure the success of the Project but the success of the Project assuming other actors are successful in their efforts. Cases of illegal logging brought to the attention of the authorities but not prosecuted due to lack of resources is not a Project failing yet an indicator of Project success is number of forest crime convictions for illegal logging.

The focus on Monitoring and Evaluation, in particular the use of those results to reshape training content, approach and Project strategy should continue. The Project should also consider how to monitor the medium and longer term impact of the training. The Project has used M and E well to examine and change – where necessary – the training approach and content. There is no doubt this would be enhanced by considering an M and E strategy for the medium and longer term.

Implement a systemic process to ensure the relevant thematic Global Programmes based in HQs such as Anti-Corruption, Anti-Money Laundering and Wildlife and Forest Crime can be utilised by the Project thereby ensuring integration of UNODC work across thematic and Country / Regional Programming. To date the country office and the regional office relationship appears to work well regarding integration of Project objectives and activities with regional objectives. There is far less evidence of integration of the Project with relevant thematic Global Programmes based at HQ in Vienna.

The Project should engage the help of Human Rights and Gender mainstreaming experts to assist in these aspects of Project activity. Any new Project should look to implement as many Human Rights and Gender mainstreaming approaches as possible from the relevant, written advice and guidance available e.g. the 'Gender Mainstreaming in the work of UNODC' document. Where additional support is then required the Project should make the appropriate request to tap into HQ expertise.

V. BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Over the course of this evaluation, various best practices and lessons learned and could be identified:

- That training can unlock a feeling of empowerment that encourages individual thought and the confidence to debate strategy and tactics with senior officers in a manner that they felt they couldn't have done before the training. This empowerment comes from the receipt of knowledge allowing them to better argue their case in these discussions. This has been evidenced quite clearly through the two examples of officers recently trained by UNODC alerting the authorities to practices that enable forest crime to be committed.

- The focus on capacity building through training and workshops delivered locally with – as far as possible – local trainers and experts. The need for local, community support in certain cultural environments can often be a necessity for success.

- The concept of using effective Monitoring and Evaluation for Project benefit has proved successful. It can be used to assess the quality of training and trainers, the quality and relevance of the training content and used clustering of training data and feedback to inform the strategic direction of a Project.

- The use of a risk register to assist putting in place early response mechanisms for developing situations and the ability to adapt the risk register to a changing environment can have benefits way beyond the resources required to create and maintain the risk register itself.

- The requirement to mainstream Human Rights and Gender into all UNODC work and Projects places an onerous responsibility and task on Project Teams that are often resource stretched and lack the specialist expertise and knowledge to address these issues in a meaningful and effective fashion. The first resource any Project should utilise when considering the gender issue is the 'Gender Mainstreaming in the work of UNODC' publication. However, in general, UNODC and the wider UN family should consider how its centralised expertise in these areas can be better devolved into the field.

- Those implementing any programme (e.g. Umoja) that will have such a substantial effect upon the efficient running of Projects, should better analyse and communicate detail that will allow Project Managers the opportunity to prepare their Projects and Project stakeholders against any potential negative impact.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

I. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

Reasons behind the evaluation taking place

The final independent project evaluation is conducted close to the end of the project as envisaged in the project document. This external evaluation initiated by the UNODC is also in line with the UNODC Evaluation Policy, norms and standards. The project ends on 29 July 2016 and therefore it is proposed to conduct the evaluation in April-June 2016. The evaluation seeks to provide accountability to the donor by determining whether the project objectives were met or not, assess the utilization of resources, identify areas for improvement and to learn lessons for executing the next phase of the project as well as formulate a strategy after the life of the project. The outcome of the evaluation will be shared with Core Learning Partners to the project.

The UNODC/Independent Evaluation Unit templates and guidelines on evaluation are available at

http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/independent-project-evaluations-step-by-step.html

II. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The Final Independent Project Evaluation will assess the performance of the project in two areas:

1. Progress of the portfolio towards achieving the objective of the project and the status of the portfolio in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, human rights and gender, lessons learned and best practices;

2. Operational performance in terms of relevance and effectiveness of the project governance, management mechanisms and level of compliance with national context and requirements.

Both above mentioned areas should be thoroughly reviewed, but stronger focus should lie on assessing the quality of the project portfolio with the intention to promote capturing lessons learned and especially recommendations for the future.

The performance of the portfolio should be assessed against the project result framework, both to show the achievement of the project objective and outputs, as well as to review the validity of the result framework as a reporting tool. The final report will represent both project findings as well as the programmatic assessment.

The evaluation shall cover the project on "Strengthening Criminal Justice responses on Forest Crimes to Support REDD+ Implementation in Indonesia" from December 2013 till end of the field mission (tentatively end May 2016). It shall cover the geographic jurisdiction of Indonesia with a special focus on the three project target areas of Keerom District (Papua), Raja Ampat District (West Papua) and Kapuas District (Central Kalimantan). The project activities and objectives are detailed within the project document.

The evaluation report will be prepared in English.

III.   EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lessons learned, and, will respond to the following below questions, however, provided as indicative only, and required to be further refined by the Evaluator.

Relevance
Relevance of a project or programme is the extent to which its objectives are continuously consistent with recipient needs, UNODC mandate and overarching strategies and policies
1. To what extent did the project respond to the needs and priorities of national partner organisations, i.e. Ministry of Environment and Forestry, law enforcement agencies (INP, AGO, KPK), financial intelligence unit (PPATK), forestry service agencies at provincial and district levels, local communities (land right–owners, forest police partners, civil society organizations) and NGOs (local, national and international)?
2. To what extent are the project outputs and outcomes suitable and informative targets, e.g. are they Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART)?
3. To what extent were local circumstances taken into consideration when planning and implementing this project?
Efficiency
Efficiency is a measure of how resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into outputs
1. To what extent were inputs converted into outputs in a cost efficient and timely manner, and how have unexpected causes of delay been managed?
2. To what extent have all planned outputs been delivered in a logical sequence and with high

quality?
Effectiveness   Effectiveness is the extent to which a project or programme achieves its objectives and outcomes
1. To what extent did the project achieve its planned objective and outcomes?
3. What is the quality of the outcomes as perceived by national partner organisations?
4. To what extent were appropriate measures taken to mitigate unplanned negative and positive effects on target groups contributing to results produced/ services provided?
Impact   Impact is the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term economic, environmental, social change(s) produced or likely to be produced by a project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, after the project was implemented
1. What difference has the project made to beneficiaries?
2. To what extent have law enforcement investigation techniques promoted by the project contrinuted to successful prosecutions and convictions of forest crime cases in project target areas?
3. What are the intended or unintended positive and negative long-term social, economic, technical, environmental, and other effects on individuals, communities, and institutions?
Sustainability   Sustainability is the extent to which the benefits of the project or programme will last after its termination and the probability of continued long-term benefits. Projects and programmes need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable
1. To what extent are the project results (impact if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the project ends?
2. Is stakeholders' engagement likely to continue, be scaled up, replicated or institutionalized after external funding ceases?
3. What is the level of ownership of the project by target groups and how will it impact sustainability after the project ends?
Partnerships and cooperation   Partnerships and cooperation is a measure of the level and quality of UNODC's cooperation with partners and implementing partners (e.g. donors, NGOs, Governments, other UN agencies etc.)
1. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established (including UN agencies) and

synergies been created in the delivery of assistance?
2. To what extent were efficient cooperation arrangements established (e.g. between UNODC and Government at national and local levels, donors, other UN agencies, and other relevant partners)?
Human rights and gender Evaluate whether mainstreaming of human rights and gender was considered in project design and implementation
1. To what extent were human rights considerations mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the project?
2. To what extent were gender considerations mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the project?
Lessons learned Finally the evaluation will look at lessons learned and best practices of the project
1. What lessons can be learned from the project implementation in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in the future?
2. What best practices emerged from the project implementation?
3. What lessons can be drawn from unintended results?

After the Inception Report the following four questions were added:

Q1. What practical measures have been taken by the Project to encourage all stakeholders in the Project to address human rights issues?

Q2. What practical measures have been taken by the Project to encourage all stakeholders in the Project to address gender mainstreaming issues?

Q3. How were external (non-UNODC managed) and internal (UNODC managed) risks to the sustainability of the Project activities identified, analysed and controlled?

Q4. How were the longer term impacts of training and non-training activities assessed?

ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

Face-to-face interview questions for all stakeholders

Q1. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being very poor and 7 being excellent how would you rate the overall impact of the Project?
Q2. What is the most significant change you have seen as a direct result of this UNODC Project?
Q3. If you could change one aspect of the Project what would that be, and why?
Q4. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being not likely at all and 7 being extremely likely how would you rate the sustainability of the Project's activities?

Interview questions for Project and UNODC staff

Q1. What was the greatest challenge you faced in attempting delivery upon the Project's objective?
Q2. What practical measures have been taken by the Project to encourage all stakeholders in the Project to address human rights issues?
Q3. What practical measures have been taken by the Project to encourage all stakeholders in the Project to address gender mainstreaming issues?
Q4. How were external (non-UNODC managed) and internal (UNODC managed) risks to the sustainability of the Project activities identified, analysed and controlled?
Q5. How were the longer term impacts of training and non-training activities assessed?
Q6. What is required to improve human rights and gender mainstreaming into the Project?

 Interview questions for Project partners

Q1. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being very poor and 7 being excellent how would you rate the effectiveness of cooperation with the Project?
Q2. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being not likely at all and 7 being extremely likely how would you rate the likelihood of your continued cooperation with UNODC in similar projects?

Interview questions for Donor

Q1. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being very unsatisfied and 7 being fully satisfied how satisfied are you with the manner in which the Project has managed your funds?
Q2. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 being not likely at all and 7 being extremely likely how would you rate the likelihood of your country to fund similar projects with the UNODC as your implementation partner?

ANNEX III.   DESK REVIEW LIST

Country Programme Indonesia 2012 – 2015
Global Programme for combating wildlife and forest crime – Project document 2014
Project Document – Dec 2013
Annual Donor Report – Feb 2016
Annual Progress Report – 2014
Annual Progress Report – 2015
Financial Report – 2014
Project Revision – June 2015
Project Revision – March 2016
Project Revision – Sep 2015
Semi-Annual Progress report Jan – June 2014
Semi-Annual Progress report Jan – June 2015
Uncertified Financial report 2014 – 2015
Work and Monitoring Plan 2016
Steering Committee Meeting 21.04.15
UNODC Concept Note for Future Activities
UNODC Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines

ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

Number of interviewees	Organisation	Country
Six	Recipients	Indonesia
Seven	State beneficiaries	Indonesia
Two	Donor	Norway
Three	External parties	Indonesia
Five	Internal (UNODC) parties	UNODC

Total: 23 (20 male; 3 female)