

UNDP PARLIAMENTARY
STRENGTHENING OUTPUT
OF THE
DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME
IN MYANMAR

EVALUATION REPORT

1 September 2016

Evaluation Team:

- Niall Johnston, Team Leader
- Sai Tun Thiha, Team Member

The views expressed in this report are those of the Evaluation Team and do not necessarily reflect the position of the United Nations Development Programme.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	1
Acronyms and Abbreviations	1
Executive Summary	2
Context.....	2
Key Findings.....	2
Lessons Learned	3
Summary of Recommendations	4
Introduction	5
Background	5
Description of the Parliamentary Output.....	7
Evaluation Scope and Objectives	7
Evaluation Approach and Methodology.....	8
Evaluation Questions.....	8
Methodology	9
Evaluation Constraints	9
Findings	10
Programme Management	10
Union Hluttaw	13
Regional and State Hluttaws	15
Conclusions and Recommendations	15
Relevance	15
Effectiveness	16
Efficiency	18
Sustainability	19
Recommendations	20
Lessons Learned	21
Results Framework.....	21
Relationships	22
Programme Management	22
Annexes.....	22
A. Evaluation Terms of Reference	23
B. Inception Report	29
C. Persons Consulted.....	41
D. Key Documents Reviewed.....	44

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation Team would in particular like to express its appreciation and thanks to all those consulted in Mandalay, Mon, Nay Pyi Taw and Yangon, and by Skype, for their time and generosity in sharing their views, experiences, and insights throughout the in-Myanmar consultations.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AIPA	ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly
BPSS	Bureau for Policy and Programmes Support, UNDP New York
the Component	Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia
DIP	Democratic Institutions and Processes coordinating group
DP	Development Partners
the Evaluation	Independent Evaluation of the Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme
ICG	International Crisis Group
IFES	International Foundation for Electoral Systems
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisations
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
IRI	International Republican Institute
JCC	Union Hluttaw Joint Coordinating Committee
MCERP	Myanmar Center to Empower Regional Parliaments
MP	Member of Parliament
NDI	National Democratic Institute for International Affairs
STA	Senior Technical Advisor
TAF	The Asia Foundation
TOC	Theory of Change
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluations Group
WBG	World Bank Group

Executive Summary

Context

1. UNDP's Parliamentary Strengthening output is part of UNDP Myanmar's Democratic Governance Programme under the UNDP Myanmar Country Action Plan. The UNDP Democratic Governance Programme supports more open and responsive governance so that the state will be better able to improve the lives of Myanmar's poorest and most vulnerable people, and overturn a legacy of conflict and mistrust in favor of sustainable development and inclusive growth. Recognising that UNDP has a single Country-level programme for its work in Myanmar and to avoid confusion over references to 'outputs', the Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme will be referred to in this report as 'the Component'.
2. Elections to the union, state and regional Hluttaws took place for the first time in November 2010. By-elections were held in 2012 and the second general election in November 2015. The 2nd Hluttaws commenced their work in February 2016. In both the Union and State and Region Hluttaws, there was large turnover in members between the first and second Hluttaws.
3. The Inter-Parliamentarian Union is an implementing partner of the Component at the Union level and UNDP has been working closely with the House of Commons, UK, and the House of Representatives, Australia, in implementing several of the activities.

Key Findings

4. The Component has undoubtedly been relevant although beneficiary satisfaction does not necessarily mean that Component activities are aligned with their priorities and there is some scope to improve relevance.
5. At an anecdotal level, reasonable progress appears to have been made and the Component has clearly been successful but it is difficult to quantify this objectively as the reporting frameworks lack clarity and are too focussed on activity levels.
6. Where change has been observed in staff attitudes and behaviour, this is largely attributable to UNDP working in collaboration with IPU in a successful partnership that maximises impact and harnesses the added value brought by the House of Commons' programme. Sub-nationally, work with Members of Parliament at a leadership level, although limited, has been effective and the role of UNDP has been significant.
7. Undoubtedly, the key result has been the adoption of the Union Hluttaw's strategic plan and this has properly shaped all subsequent engagement by the technical assistance team. Important though this has been, there is plenty still to be achieved in developing detailed business implementation plans that will be of more specific use in aligning UNDP's priorities with those of counterparts.
8. UNDP's delivery of support through the Component has been appropriate and the engagement with IPU is clearly constructive. Staff have responded well to training methodologies that are innovative in the context of Myanmar.
9. Given the absence of a technical assistance team for sub-national work, overall implementation has been as efficient as it could be although there have been higher transaction costs than would otherwise have been the case. The initial decision to centralise work with sub-national Hluttaws was appropriate and the decision that this work will, for the remainder of the CPAP, be delivered mainly

through clustered activities is also appropriate.

10. At Union level, the decision to locate the Programme Specialist in Yangon has resulted in considerable inefficiencies. Whilst it is recognised that the Programme Specialist needs to spend time with the rest of the programme team, efficiencies in overall strategic direction can only be achieved in counterparts not only know who their strategic interlocutor is but also have immediate access to that person on a frequent basis.

Lessons Learned

11. The current results framework has focussed too much on outputs rather than outcomes. There should be a clearer emphasis on seeking change, with the use of realistic outcomes given the relatively short life of the Component thus far. A results framework for a new Programme should have lower level outcome statements as well as appropriate objectively verifiable indicators that lie within the control of the Component rather than depending on external factors.
12. There is little doubt that the Component would not have enjoyed the success that it has had to date, or even been able to operate at all, without a significant investment in building relationships with key counterparts. For understandable reasons, this has been more broad-based at Union level but, if there is to be successful increase in activity at Regional and State level in any new Programme, there must be a similar approach that identifies key drivers for change beyond the Speakers and Directors.
13. Programme Specialists must have a much higher visibility with their counterparts at both Union and Region/State level. This will ensure that strategic direction is given by UNDP in a way that is appropriate and does not blur the boundaries of the technical assistance teams.
14. While the development of the Component was responsive and appropriately flexible during the current Programme, more attention to programme design needs to be given during the development of a new Programme so that there is a clear, and shared, vision of what success will look like and what is realistic within the overall time frame.

Summary of Recommendations

- Recommendation 1:** There should be more sustained engagement with counterparts by the programme team with the Union Hluttaw Programme Specialist being based at the Nay Pyi Taw Field Office.
- Recommendation 2:** The Work Plan for the Union Hluttaw until December 2017 should clearly align itself with priorities identified by counterparts and be based on detailed requirements extrapolated from the Strategic Plan's higher level objectives.
- Recommendation 3:** There should be an increased engagement with MPs whilst continuing to focus on consolidating staff learning.
- Recommendation 4:** The current planned level of engagement at Region and State level should be maintained for the remainder of the current CPAP.
- Recommendation 5:** The evaluation plan should be improved to capture information regarding how knowledge learned is applied and what behavioural change has taken place.
- Recommendation 6:** Reporting should be restructured to focus on achievement and be less defensive.
- Recommendation 7:** The technical assistance team for a new CPAP should be modelled on a CTA focused on the Union Hluttaw but with overall responsibility for all parliamentary work and a STA focused on State and Regional Hluttaws.
- Recommendation 8:** There should be three guiding principles for future programming:
- Resource teams and exemplar materials should come from transitional and recently transitional parliaments where possible rather than from settled democracies;
 - International resource teams should assist in understanding how to apply the knowledge they are imparting to the Myanmar context; and
 - Where possible, national Myanmar experience should be utilised.
- Recommendation 9:** UNDP should not coordinate multilateral interventions with the JCC.
- Recommendation 10:** UNDP should take the lead in remapping current and proposed engagement by donors and implementers.
- Recommendation 11:** The Learning Centre should continue to develop a searchable database of all learning activities providing access to learning materials and the ability to participate virtually in activities already delivered.
- Recommendation 12:** There should be a more hands-on approach to building the capacity of steering committees such as that for the Learning Centre.

Introduction

15. Responsive governance, peace building and the realization of human rights and gender equality are critical to ensure that Myanmar's development gains are felt by people across the country. Union and State and Region Parliaments are important institutions in Myanmar's transition, and the effective performance of their representative, legislative and oversight functions will be critical to ensuring that people's voices are heard, conflicting perspectives are debated, and that human rights are respected. An effective parliament is an important means to securing greater independence, mutual accountability and cooperation between the three branches of the state. UNDP has supported the Union Parliament since 2013 in establishing key services for Members as part of a Parliament-led institutional change agenda that will build the Union Parliament into an effective institution. UNDP also engages on a similar path with the Region and State level parliaments, to help them fulfil their representation, legislation and oversight functions.
16. In line with the evaluation plan for the UNDP Myanmar Country Office, UNDP commissioned an independent evaluation of its Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme. The Evaluation comes beyond the halfway point of the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) for the Country Office, which covers the period 2013 – 2017, and is intended to provide recommendations for UNDP's next country programme as well as for the remainder of the current programme cycle.

Background

17. UNDP's Parliamentary Strengthening output is part of UNDP Myanmar's Democratic Governance Programme under the UNDP Myanmar Country Action Plan. The UNDP Democratic Governance Programme supports more open and responsive governance so that the state will be better able to improve the lives of Myanmar's poorest and most vulnerable people, and overturn a legacy of conflict and mistrust in favor of sustainable development and inclusive growth. The official outcome statement of the Democratic Governance Programme is: "Promotion of democratic governance and the rule of law to strengthen democratic institutions and the advancement of human rights." The programme contains four outputs. Along with Parliamentary Strengthening, the programme also has outputs on Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Development Effectiveness and Public Administration. Three evaluations will be done in the Democratic Governance Programme in 2016, two output level evaluations of the Parliamentary Strengthening Output and of the Rule of Law Output and one outcome level evaluation of the Democratic Governance Programme. Recognising that UNDP has a single Country-level programme for its work in Myanmar and to avoid confusion over references to 'outputs', the Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme will be referred to in this report as 'the Component'.
18. Myanmar had been governed by various military dictatorships for all but twelve of the intervening years between gaining independence from British Colonial rule in 1948 and the establishment of a quasi-civilian government in 2008 under a new Constitution. The 2008 Constitution provided a new framework for governance in Myanmar. At the national level, the 2008 Constitution established a legislative branch comprising a Union Assembly (Pyidaungsu Hluttaw) consisting of two chambers – the Pyithu Hluttaw (People's Assembly) with 440 seats and the Amyotha Hluttaw (Nationalities Assembly) with 224 seats. The Pyithu Hluttaw and the Amyotha Hluttaw are generally equal in status. The Constitution provides that the Pyithu Hluttaw shall be "elected on the basis of township as well as population" and the Amyotha Hluttaw "on an equal number of representatives elected from Region and States."

19. The Constitution also establishes unicameral legislatures in each of the seven states and seven regions within Myanmar for a total of 14 Hluttaws (or Assemblies). The powers of these legislatures are set out in the Region and State Parliament Act.
20. Elections to the union, state and regional Hluttaws took place for the first time in November 2010. By-elections were held in 2012 and the second general election in November 2015. The 2nd Hluttaws commenced their work in February 2016. In both the Union and State and Region Hluttaws, there was large turnover in members between the first and second Hluttaws.
21. At the time of approval of the new Country Plan in 2013, Myanmar was a country which was emerging from long isolation and military rule, and still facing international sanctions. UNDP had to develop new relationships with state institutions –including parliament, this is an important consideration for the evaluation of this Component.
22. The UNDP Myanmar Parliamentary Strengthening Output statement is “Parliament at Union levels and selected state/ region levels perform their functions.” The Component covers capacity building for the Parliamentarians and the Parliamentary Administration for the Union Hluttaw as well as for the region and state Hluttaws. Initially, the parliamentary leadership at Union level made a decision, in conjunction with UNDP, to focus capacity development on staff but, since early 2016, there has been approval to adopt a parallel approach to providing development opportunities for MPs as well as staff.
23. Since 2013, the Component has grown from early capacity building initiatives and relationship building, to supporting the strategic directions and development of the Myanmar Parliament at both national and sub-national level. The first year of programming under the new Country Programme in 2013, sought a balance of immediate activity implementation to develop and strengthen the relationship with the Union Parliament together with work to establish buy in and mechanisms for longer term support at the Union level. Building on from the immediate activities, UNDP supported the Union Hluttaw in developing their own Strategic Plan. It states the vision, mission and core values of the Hluttaw, as well as a ‘roadmap’ of objectives and priority actions that will ensure that achievements will be sustained and built upon in both the first and second Hluttaws.
24. Strategic development plans have been established by the Hluttaw in the key areas identified by the Strategic Plan including on Committees, ICT, Research, and the Learning Centre (which was established with UNDP support to provide long term capacity building and training and skills development for Parliamentarians and Parliamentary staff). Work plans have been developed in these areas which identify and address priority needs.
25. In line with the CPAP, the Component has focused on implementing the priority activities identified in the Strategic Plan, and work plans under the guidance of the Parliamentary Leadership. The Component has also been working with the Parliamentary administration in preparing the transition to the 2nd Myanmar Parliament with a focus on both strengthening and improving services available to MPs and supporting the Parliament in organizing its work in the plenary and committees.
26. The Inter-Parliamentarian Union is an implementing partner of the Component at the Union level and UNDP has been working closely with the House of Commons, UK, and the House of Representatives, Australia, in implementing several of the activities.
27. Region and State Hluttaws started much later in 2014. Most of the support was mainly focusing on familiarizing Members of Parliament and staff about the separation of powers, the role and function

of parliament and the budget process. Support was also provided to the Region and State Hluttaws in preparing for the transition to the 2nd Hluttaws. This includes induction for members and leadership for Speakers. Rather than provide targeted support to individual Region and State Hluttaws, the Component has mainly provided support to all the Region and State Hluttaws through joint events, workshops and trainings rather and through a few targeted pilots, from which the lessons learnt are shared with other Hluttaws.

Description of the Parliamentary Output

28. The Component was developed as Output 2 of Pillar Three of the CPAP. The Output is described as: “Legislative, Oversight and Representation Functions Performed by Parliaments at the Union and Selected State and Region Levels Institutionalized.”

29. To achieve this, Component assistance to the parliament sector was structured around five key results areas or sub-outputs:

Sub-output 1: Improved capacity of MPs, with special focus on women, at the Union and State/Region levels to perform their functions in an effective, transparent and inclusive way.

Sub-output 2: Enhanced institutional capacity of key parliamentary committees at the Union and State/Region levels to ensure the parliament is able to pass quality legislation including consideration to gender responsiveness, marginalized groups, people living with and affected by HIV/Aids and disabilities and oversee government activities.

Sub-output 3: Improved capacity of parliaments to effectively communicate for internal and external purposes

Sub-output 4: Enhanced capacity of the parliamentary secretariats at the Union and State/Region levels to provide effective support to MPs, committees and the respective parliaments.

Sub-output 5: Civil society and media more aware and empowered to participate in democratic political processes.

Evaluation Scope and Objectives

30. The Evaluation’s scope covered all activities, results, strategies, operational measures, monitoring, implementation, management and staffing arrangements of the output. It considered all work between March 2013 and the start date of the evaluation. The evaluation covered both the Union Hluttaw and the Region and State Hluttaws and assesses progress against the achievement of the output statement “Parliament at Union levels and selected state/ region levels perform their functions”.

31. The Evaluation took into consideration, the feedback garnered from Members of Parliament, the Hluttaw administration employees, implementing partners, UNDP staff and management, donor representatives, UNDP programme teams under the democratic governance portfolio and across the other thematic areas of local governance and environmental sustainability.

32. The Evaluation also integrated crosscutting issues in its assessment, particularly with regards to how well Component interventions have supported parliamentary strengthening initiatives that reflect the needs of diverse groups, especially women and vulnerable groups. The application and effectiveness of human rights based approaches were also considered during the evaluation process.
33. The Evaluation took place in within the context of the overall evaluation plan for the UNDP Myanmar Country Office. The evaluation followed a 2015 mid-term evaluation of the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) for the Country Office, which covers the period 2013 – 2017. The evaluation also provides recommendations for UNDP’s next country programme as well as for the remainder of the current programme cycle.

Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Evaluation Questions

34. The Evaluation was guided by the following questions:

Relevance:

- a. To what extent is UNDP’s work in parliament strengthening, consistent with and responding to emerging national and local policies, priorities and needs of the direct beneficiaries? Is the Component positioned to support the vision and priorities of the new parliament?
- b. Are the current focus areas that the Component is engaged the most relevant for parliamentary strengthening and institutional development in Myanmar; looking forward are there focus areas which should be expanded; downscaled; or stopped? Is the balance in focus between the Union Parliament and Sub-National Parliaments right?

Effectiveness:

- c. To what extent has progress been made towards the achievement of the output? What has been UNDP’s contribution to change?
- d. What are the key results and changes?
- e. To what extent was the Component’s selected method of delivery appropriate to the delivery context, including the partnership with the IPU?
- f. To what extent has progress been made on gender inclusion, women’s equality and empowerment in relation to the output statement and wider Democratic Governance Programme Theory of Change?

Efficiency:

- g. Have resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the Component been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results?
- h. Has the Component managed implementation across the various Hluttaws efficiently?
- i. How have partnerships (especially with IPU and the House of Commons) influenced the efficiency of the Component in delivering against its portfolio?
- j. To what degree has UNDP incorporated and fostered South-South cooperation, knowledge management, and volunteerism and UN coordination in the implementation of this

Component? How beneficial have these been?

Sustainability:

- k. What indications are there that achievements so far will be sustained (e.g. national ownership, national systems and structures, individual capacity)
- l. Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results?

Methodology

35. An Inception Report (*Annex B*) was issued, and agreed, shortly after the commencement of the in-country element of the evaluation – that report sets out the detailed methodology for the Evaluation Team’s work.
36. The Evaluation Team was guided by the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments*¹, which were developed by IPU in collaboration with the European Parliament, NDI and UNDP.
37. A core principle of the methodology was to focus on how well the Component, both in design and delivery, had resulted in a transformation of behaviour that will lead to the desired impacts. This means assessing whether there has been improvement in Knowledge, Understanding, Skills and Attitudes. The sum and process of positive transformation in these four areas leads to Behaviour change – KUSA(B). There are three Domains of Learning that KUSA(B) directly relates to:
 - Cognitive or intellectual learning – Knowledge & Understanding
 - Psychomotor or Physical learning – Skills Development
 - Affective or Emotional learning – Attitude Change
38. As the in-country work was being conducted, the opportunity arose to run two focus groups in the Union Hluttaw – one with staff who had been trained as trainers and one with staff undergoing training as liaison officers for the forthcoming AIPA meeting in September 2016. These focus groups provided useful insights from junior staff as beneficiaries who might not otherwise have had an opportunity to contribute to the evaluation.

Evaluation Constraints

39. Time and logistical constraints made it impossible to visit all Region and State Hluttaws and so UNDP selected one Regional Hluttaw (Mandalay) and one State Hluttaw (Mon). The Evaluation Team is unable to say whether or not visits to other Hluttaws would have yielded differing findings.
40. Despite a commitment on the part of the programme team to the ‘Delivering as One’ approach, it was disappointing that no meetings had been planned with other UN agencies and the one meeting that the evaluation team requested, with UN Women, did not take place as arranged although that was beyond the control of the programme team.

¹ [*Common Principles for Support to Parliaments*](#), IPU, 2015

Findings

41. The Evaluation Team noted that there had been two related evaluations within the past year – a mid-term evaluation of CPAP in September 2015 and a mid-term evaluation of Rule of Law output in the period June to August 2016. Overall the Evaluation Team found that a number of issues raised in these reports also had resonance with the findings on this Component.
42. In the case of the CPAP evaluation the following points have significant relevance for the current evaluation:
 - Identify ways to tell more effectively the story of achievement
 - Address overall programme governance arrangements
 - Explore within the UN agencies ... the opportunity to develop a joint programme
43. The Rule of Law evaluation showed relevance in these areas:
 - Maximising continuity
 - Evolve the strategic rationale for engaging with the [parliament] sector
 - Undertake more rigorous monitoring and evaluation
 - Focusses on UNDP's areas of comparative advantage

Programme Management

44. In many ways, the period under evaluation has been a prolonged inception phase but without some of the usual strategic tools such as a design note and classic project document although it is noted that Annex V of the CPAP contains a proxy for a project document. The Evaluation Team felt that the Component had 'emerged' rather than being strategically designed although the reasons for this were fully understood. The approach taken, in terms of building up relationships, was reasonable given the particular circumstances of Myanmar but it has also created challenges for UNDP as they seek to manage and give strategic direction to the Component in the remaining period of the current Country Programme. Unfortunately, the Evaluation Team found that the programme team were often so focussed on explaining to them the slow start to the Component that they, perhaps, did not appreciate the strides that have been made and the appreciation of beneficiaries.
45. The theory of change (TOC) for Pillar 3 is, as much as anything, a justification of the context the Component emerged out of rather than a vision for the future. While change pathways are identified, it would be helpful if there was a less text-based presentation with some diagrammatic indication of the intended road map along with a clear statement that the TOC, as published, had the agreement of counterparts. Typically, a TOC is less about what *ought* to be done, and more about *why* the proposed choice of interventions is the *best* choice, based on *informed beliefs* about how change for the better happens in a complex and fluid environment such as that in Myanmar. It is an intuitive and iterative process, rather than a linear and scientific one. Its value lies in helping UNDP and the technical assistance team establish a shared, best judgement about the right interventions for this project to make, with the right people and organisations, at the right time and with the right resources. It provides a rationale to which the programme can return at different stages to see whether this judgement still holds true.
46. This focus on explaining context, combined with the way in which the Component 'emerged', creates considerable difficulty in describing what success will look like. It is also notable that there is no shared vision of success between UNDP and the beneficiaries although the successful

production and ownership of the Union Hluttaw Strategic Plan indicates that there is some basis for a shared vision. This needs to be better articulated and agreed by both UNDP and counterparts. At the same time, a shared vision has to be developed with the Regional and State Hluttaws. At a lower level, the current results framework and reporting formats make it difficult to identify impact and potential impact and this was a recurring comment made by donors who felt that they had a good understanding of the Component at an activity level but no clear understanding of it strategically, either standalone or as part of the overall UNDP Country Programme.

47. The observed tendency of the programme team to constantly refer to the originating environment, coupled with reporting formats that could be better structured to portray achievement rather than challenges, especially at a quarterly level, leads to a muted statement of achievements to date. While efforts have been made to improve communications and produce external-facing stories and op-eds, not enough use has been made of evaluation tools such as value creation stories to provide an analytic tool to demonstrate achievement in a reporting context. The Evaluation Team recognizes that the imminent appointment of two UN Volunteers will, in part, allow for more structured work to be done in this area.
48. The Evaluation Team found a number of examples of individuals whose behaviour had undergone a positive change as a consequence of the Component's interventions but these stories had not been used to demonstrate impact or even, in most cases, been recorded. While it is too early to be able to identify achieved value, there are certainly examples of applied value that could, and should, be used to demonstrate the successful work of the Component and its contribution to parliamentary development at both Union and Region/State level.
49. Overall, the Evaluation Team found that there is room for significant improvement in documentation management within the programme team. Following an unfortunate incident when a large amount of material was deleted from a shared drive, there appears to be a reliance on individuals storing their own versions of documents and this can clearly lead to several different versions being in use at the same time or else no documentation being available as it has been assumed that someone else is retaining a copy for the archive.
50. The relationship between programme staff and the technical assistance team is one in which there is often creative tension, especially with the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). While the programme staff are clearly responsible for strategic management, the CTA does have a key function in offering strategic advice as part of the delivery of technical assistance. The CTA has been more closely involved in aspects of both representation and logistics, including procurement, than would usually be the case. It is clear to the Evaluation Team that the CTA has become the *de facto* face of UNDP within the Union Hluttaw – within the senior leadership of the three offices of the Union Hluttaw, there was very little recognition of the role of the programme team.
51. The Evaluation Team feel that the primary cause for the erosion of boundaries has been the decision to continue to locate the Programme Specialist in Yangon at the UNDP Country Office rather than in Nay Pyi Taw. While it would not be appropriate for the Programme Specialist and CTA to be co-located in terms of offices, there is a strong case to be made for the Programme Specialist to be based at the UNDP Field Office in the capital. Whilst it is recognized that the Programme Specialist has made a considerable number of visits to Nay Pyi Taw over the period covered by the evaluation, the lack of awareness amongst counterparts of these visits is of concern.
52. The Evaluation Team formed the clear view that, until such a relocation takes place, with the Programme Specialist spending at least three days a week in Nay Pyi Taw, the misunderstanding by counterparts of the CTA's role will continue with an accompanying increase in unhelpful tension

between the CTA and the programme team. Clearly, the Programme Specialist has key functions, such as liaising and fostering linkages with other UN agencies and DPs, that can best be discharged by being in Yangon and it was suggested to the Evaluation Team that relocation should take place within the context of the overall move of UNDP's Country Office to the capital. Whilst understanding this rationale, the Evaluation Team holds to its view that the Programme Specialist should relocate sooner rather than later not least at a time when discussions on a future CPAP will be ramping up.

53. The Evaluation Team found that there was good collaboration within the three outputs of Pillar 3. It is clear that there has been significant engagement by the Component with both Rule of Law and Development Effectiveness and that, especially at Union level, the teams are working well together to maximize leverage.
54. This collaborative working within Pillar 3 is, unfortunately, not replicated across the overall Country Programme and across the UN family. Whilst the most obvious interaction between Pillars is with Pillar 1, the Evaluation Team found that there had been very limited engagement and little real understanding of how the Component contributes to the overall country strategy. Reaching beyond UNDP, there has been very little evidence of the Component being utilized strategically in Delivery as One. While there have been a number of commendable engagements with other UN agencies, there is little evidence of a coherent strategy although the Evaluation Team recognize that this has not been because of a lack of effort by the Component.
55. The Evaluation Team were told of some concerns by counterparts, particularly at Union level, that procurement on behalf of the Component was often not as transparent as they would wish. A strong view was expressed that it felt as though counterparts were only being given choices within a pre-selected range of options rather than being exposed to the full range of options and the purchase of ICT equipment was referenced in this regard. A re-statement of how procurement options and procurement conducted are produced would be helpful in these circumstances.
56. The relationship between UNDP and IPU is clearly intended to be a partnership and has produced obvious gains for both parties as well as increasing the effectiveness of technical assistance delivery to the Union Hluttaw. For understandable reasons, this partnership has had to be formalised by way of a contract in which IPU is, effectively, a sub-contractor to UNDP. This has brought about some difficulty for both parties in terms of reporting deadlines not being always synchronised with their own reporting and delivery structures. It is also important to note that IPU's engagement with the Union Hluttaw is multi-layered and not solely through the Component. This is important to acknowledge, not least because of the new IPU and UN Women project in support of female parliamentarians.
57. Whilst UNDP appears to maintain good relations with other implementing organisations, there is an inevitable conflict of interest in being seen as both a coordinator and an implementer. Building relationships with other implementers needs to be understood in the context of facilitation rather than gatekeeping. The key roles of UNDP in liaising with the Union Hluttaw Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) and co-chairing the DIP are undoubtedly areas in which UNDP adds value but, especially in relation to the JCC, the appropriateness of seeking to coordinate rather than collaborate should be kept under review. In this regard, it will be important UNDP continues to make efforts to avoid the perception that it is using its presence within the Hluttaw to block access by other implementers. Although the Evaluation Team does not believe this to be the case, it is important that UNDP is seen to be open to facilitating access to political and staff leadership figures.

Union Hluttaw

58. The management structure at the Union Hluttaw has evolved over time with the offices for the two Houses being established and, to an extent, becoming self-sufficient. While the role of the Permanent Secretary continues to be important in ensuring coordination and reducing transaction costs, there is now a clear appetite on the part of the senior leadership teams in both Houses to have more direct engagement with the Component, both for programmatic and technical assistance purposes. As the Union Hluttaw has developed its management structure, the Component has not been so quick to adapt and has tended to rely on the time-tested mechanism of working through the Permanent Secretary. Consideration is being given to how to move towards an asymmetric but coordinated approach to work with the three offices but this tends to be driven by pragmatic issues and targets of opportunity rather than through the development of a strategy.
59. Initially, the parliamentary leadership made a decision, in conjunction with UNDP, to focus capacity development on staff but, since early 2016, there has been approval to adopt a parallel approach to providing development opportunities for MPs as well as staff – MPs when the Hluttaw is in session and staff when out of session. Both these decisions were reasonable at their respective points in time although, clearly, the 87% turnover of MPs placed an enormous burden on the Component. It is too early to tell whether the initial focus on staff has delivered more effective support to parliamentarians as MPs were not best placed in the early days to judge what support they needed – the second Members' survey planned for late 2016 should produce more informed reflection by MPs on this.
60. The Evaluation Team noted that the perfectly reasonable focus on building relationships has meant more effort has been placed on the delivery of large events such as the induction programmes and the upcoming AIPA conference rather than planned programmes of structured learning activities. In particular, the AIPA conference has meant that learning activities have been pushed back with priority being given to preparing Hluttaw staff to be able to support the conference effectively. Whilst the skills being developed are of merit in themselves, there is some question as to whether they match the priority needs of the Union Hluttaw as it seeks to build basic capacity in a range of areas.
61. Counterparts have expressed strong appreciation of the work of the Learning Centre and it is here that notable successes have been achieved even if those are not always successfully articulated or recorded. The staff of the Learning Centre are, to some extent, overwhelmed by the amount of work and they have had to become involved in providing support to other activities, which while necessary at a pragmatic level has also served to increase the burden. One consequence of the heavy workload has been that activities are often organized at relatively short notice and that insufficient warning is given to counterparts. While accepting that the Hluttaw does not have a parliamentary calendar, there is a clear desire on the part of counterparts to receiving a longer term forecast of learning activities and it is noted that a draft calendar for the period until the end of the current CPAP was provided to the Permanent Secretary in July but has yet to be approved. Indeed, it was suggested to the Evaluation Team that an annual training calendar would bolster support for the creation of a fixed parliamentary calendar!
62. Pedagogical methods used by the Component, especially for the induction programmes were appropriate and reflect good practice for such events. However, some beneficiaries indicated that they found learning styles other than formal lectures to be unsettling and that they were unsure as to how to participate effectively. Learning methodologies need to be better understood by beneficiaries in advance of activities taking place and beneficiaries need to be given more assistance in understanding how to respond to new methodologies so that they can be challenged in

a way that encourages learning rather than deters participants from engaging.

63. The Evaluation Team noted that the Learning Centre carries out end of activity self-evaluations by participants and this is to be commended. The usefulness of these evaluations could be improved by including a more targeted question on what participants feel they have actually learned during the activity. In part because of the work load, there has been limited attention to carrying out follow-up studies with beneficiaries to assess how learning is being applied, what changes have resulted from the acquired learning and to assist with the identification of value creation stories.
64. The Component has done well in maximising the number of beneficiaries from Learning Centre activities whilst, at the same time, ensuring that there are clear 'entry' criteria for each course. Given the need for the Hluttaw to take ownership of the nomination of participants to attend training, there will be an inevitably tension in identifying whether appropriate participants are nominated. In this respect, the varying capacity across the three Hluttaw offices may mean that there will need to be occasional House-specific learning events with either an extended syllabus or a differentiated programme to allow for some lower entry criteria.
65. Consideration to reinforcing capacity rather than broadening participant base is something that has been identified by both counterparts and the Learning Centre Manager. There is a good case to be made for learning reinforcement through follow-up activities rather than increasing the number of beneficiaries. Particularly in the remaining months of the current CPAP, it may well be that focusing on consolidating learning by selected participants would offer the best chance of building the sustainable capacity of the institution. The existing plans for integration of staff trainers into activities for the remainder of the CPAP will certainly enable those individuals to consolidate their learning and develop their knowledge, understanding and skills as trainers but there remains a question as to whether those who have already received some training should receive consolidation and advanced training before a comprehensive programme of new basic training course is provided. One way to address this might be to build on the Learning Centre's initial work to produce a bank of self-paced learning materials and encourage previous participants to use this to refresh their knowledge.
66. The Component is to be commended for its partnership approach to establishing steering groups such as that for the Learning Centre and other more technically focused groups. In meeting with members of the Learning Centre and procurement steering groups, the Evaluation Team encountered some lack of clarity amongst beneficiaries as to the role of these groups. In the case of the Learning Centre, after an initial scheduling problem where the Team met with deputies rather than steering group members themselves, there was still confusion amongst members who were met subsequently as to their role.
67. Longer term programming such as ICT and committee development is progressing and the Evaluation Team is satisfied that knowledge, understanding and skills gained by participants in the preparations for AIPA will be of benefit, particularly in relation to committee work. Both these areas of work have cross-over with the sub-national aspects of the Component and it will be important to ensure that these crossovers are identified and understood by counterparts in each Hluttaw. In the case of the Data Centre, for example, there will need to be an agreement between all parties as to whether data is compartmentalized or is accessible by any Hluttaw.
68. There has been limited success in achieving attitudinal change around gender inclusion and women's equality although the Component has demonstrated a commitment to promoting these issues in all its activities and participants have been better equipped with knowledge and skills. The lack of demand from both the parliamentary leadership and women MPs themselves, means that

this will continue to be an area in which knowledge, understanding and skills need to be built using indirect capacity building vehicles.

Regional and State Hluttaws

69. There has been reasonable progress in delivering support to the sub-national Hluttaws. The decision to prioritize centralised support was both pragmatic and efficient and the Evaluation Team was pleased to note that a cluster approach will be utilized for the delivery of the planned online learning. Counterparts expressed appreciation of the opportunities to participate in induction training at the Union Hluttaw and especially for the provision of master classes specifically for sub-national participants. The Component clearly recognizes that not all sub-national Hluttaws are homogeneous but that there are also relevant, and separate, challenges and similarities for Regions and States.
70. The Component has been able to draw on significant international experience in delivering both capacity building for Committee Chairs and the Leadership Programme for Speakers and Deputy Speakers. The choice of resource persons has been appropriate but there could be a greater emphasis placed on assisting participants in extrapolating local application from international experience. It is likely that this assistance will not be best provided by the international resource team themselves but by the identification of suitable local facilitators – the Evaluation Team does not minimize how difficult it may be to identify national experience within Myanmar.
71. Following on from the previous point, the Evaluation Team commends the Component for identifying and developing the capacity of a group of national facilitators who will assist with the deployment of the online training course. These individuals can also make a useful contribution to broader work with the sub-national Hluttaws.
72. The absence of a dedicated Technical Advisor for the work with sub-national Hluttaws has placed a burden on both the Programme Specialists, who currently have a technical advisory role for the Regions and States, and the CTA. While this overlap has produced some good results since the last elections, this cannot continue indefinitely. The Evaluation Team recognize, however, that there is little time left in the current CPAP and so it may be more appropriate to continue to make do with ad hoc technical assistance until a new Programme can be designed.
73. It is not yet clear what the role of sub-national Hluttaws will be in any new constitutional settlement that may emerge from the peace-building activities that are currently underway. In the meantime, the limited capacity of the Regional and State Hluttaws to discharge their current responsibilities means that it would be unwise, and potentially counterproductive, to increase their role in peace-building over the remainder of this CPAP – this is especially true in the absence of a fulltime technical advisor with skills in this area.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Relevance

To what extent is UNDP's work in parliament strengthening, consistent with and responding to emerging national and local policies, priorities and needs of the direct beneficiaries? Is the Component positioned to support the vision and priorities of the new parliament?

74. The Component has undoubtedly been relevant although it is important that UNDP recognizes that

beneficiary satisfaction does not necessarily mean that activities are aligned with their priorities and so relevance could be improved in some areas. Whilst this divergence of views has not been of significance as yet, there is a need to ensure that a greater dialogue takes place with counterparts in all three Hluttaw offices as well as with the JCC. This is especially important in ensuring that the JCC reflects the views of the senior leadership teams within the Union Hluttaw and not just those of the political leadership.

75. The new JCC is not yet fully functional and UNDP needs to consider how best it might support the JCC in building its capacity. In large part, this needs to be delivered through a significantly increased presence of the Programme Specialist in Nay Pyi Taw building relationships with individual members of the JCC as well the senior leadership teams of the Hluttaw. The profile of UNDP's programme team within the senior leadership teams is extremely low and, in consequence, the opportunities for engaging at a strategic level are limited. Positioning a Programme Specialist in Nay Pyi Taw would also rebalance the relationship between the programme team, technical assistance team and counterparts at the Union Hluttaw.
76. The achievement of the Union Hluttaw Strategic Plan was a significant achievement and has demonstrated attitudinal change amongst senior members of staff. However, continuing to use it provide the framework for Component activities is not sustainable in the longer term without considerable work being done to support development of detailed business implementation plans. There should be a clearer identification of Component activities to match the lower level priorities that such business implementation plans will set out. Additionally, it will only become apparent if attitudinal change has led to a corresponding change in behaviour when it is clear if there is a detailed implementation of the Strategic Plan at a practical, business implementation, level.

Are the current focus areas that the Component is engaged the most relevant for parliamentary strengthening and institutional development in Myanmar; looking forward are there focus areas which should be expanded; downscaled; or stopped? Is the balance in focus between the Union Parliament and Sub-National Parliaments right?

77. At Union level, consolidating the capacity development of staff should be the priority and there is still much to be done before the staff are capable of providing their own sustainable internal resources. It is now time, however, to increase engagement with Members of Parliament, especially in assisting them to work more effectively within Committees. Achieving a balance between working with Members of Parliament and staff will be challenging in the absence of additional resources and will, inevitably, lead to an increased work load in the short to mid-term but, with effective forward planning this should be achievable.
78. At the level of Regions and States, the low level of institutional capacity, combined with insufficient resource allocation, both human and financial, would indicate a need to increase engagement. However, in the relatively short time remaining in the current CPAP, the absence of a dedicated technical assistance team would mean either placing an unreasonable burden of the Union team or else significantly raising transaction costs. It is clear that any future programme should significantly increase support at a sub-national level but the current level of planned engagement is reasonable for the remainder of this CPAP. At whatever point work with the sub-national Hluttaws is increased, the priority should be to consolidate the basic operational functions of a legislature such as committee work, Executive oversight and an objective and appropriately resourced staff.

Effectiveness

To what extent has progress been made towards the achievement of the output? What has been UNDP's contribution to change?

79. At an anecdotal level, reasonable progress appears to have been made but it is difficult to quantify this objectively as the reporting frameworks lack clarity and are too focussed on activity levels. Even where there are clear actions associated with the groups of activity outcomes, these actions tend to be focussed back on activity and do not give a clear indication of the desired impact, and the time frame to achieve that impact. There is also currently no significant evaluation of how knowledge, understanding and skills learned through the Component are applied and to what extent, if any, attitude and behaviour has changed. In particular, work should be done to build up a library of value creation stories, which will assist in demonstrating progress towards behavioural change that can result in impact.
80. To the extent that change has been observed, at a staff level, this is largely attributable to UNDP working in collaboration with IPU in a successful partnership that maximises impact and harnesses the added value brought by the House of Commons' programme. Progress with Members of Parliament at Union level has been slower and it is difficult to assess the overall contribution of UNDP at this point as there are a number of other implementers who appear to have been more directly engaged with Members of Parliament. Sub-nationally, work with Members of Parliament at a leadership level, although limited, has been effective and the role of UNDP has been significant.
81. UNDP has become too focussed on defending the slow start to the parliamentary work and is in danger of failing to provide external, and internal, communications that show what has been achieved thus far and the potential for further change. A simple example of this is the quarterly reporting format that commences by identifying challenges and obstacles before highlighting achievements – it would not be difficult to re-order the structure of such reports to emphasise the positives.

What are the key results and changes?

82. Undoubtedly, the key result has been the adoption of the Union Hluttaw's strategic plan and this has perfectly properly shaped all subsequent engagement by the technical assistance team. Important though this has been, there is plenty still to be achieved in developing detailed implementation plans that will be of more specific use in aligning UNDP's priorities with those of counterparts.
83. The absence of an explicit design document for the Component and the focussing of the results framework at an activity level mean that it is difficult to identify other key results or to articulate changes in behaviour at more than a very basic level.

To what extent was the Component's selected method of delivery appropriate to the delivery context, including the partnership with the IPU?

84. UNDP's delivery of support through the Component has been appropriate and the engagement with IPU is clearly constructive. Staff have responded well to training methodologies that are innovative in the context of Myanmar although some individual Members of Parliament reported that they have sometimes found themselves being placed outside their comfort zones in a way that has not been conducive to learning. It is important that the technical assistance team ensure that Members of Parliament understand the reasons for the structure of learning activities from the outset so that they can focus on capacity development rather than being distracted by trying to understand non-traditional training methodologies. The Evaluation Team recognises that the feedback that they have received from some MPs in respect of training methodology does not reflect the formal evaluations carried out but nonetheless feel it important to identify that there is some concern for a

minority of participants.

To what extent has progress been made on gender inclusion, women's equality and empowerment in relation to the output statement and wider Democratic Governance Programme Theory of Change?

85. Progress in this regard has been limited although it is clear that all activities have sought to include mainstreaming of gender issues. There should be a greater engagement with UN Women, especially as IPU is about to commence a significant programme with UN Women in support of Union Hluttaw female Members of Parliament as part of a global programme. That said, it would appear that UNDP has made reasonable efforts to collaborate with UN Women but has not always been met with a reciprocally collaborative response.

Efficiency

Have resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the Component been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results?

86. Overall, the Component has managed resources appropriately although no attempt was made by the Evaluation Team to carry out an audit of expenditure, either in terms of value for money or financial accounting. In the main, there appeared to be appropriate flexibility in the allocation and use of resources to adapt to a changing, and initially challenging, enabling environment.
87. The lack of a clearly articulated, and shared, vision for success, combined with the absence of a clear project design and the restricted nature of monitoring and evaluation have all had some impact on the Component's efficiency but not to an extent where it would be possible to attribute significant disadvantage.
88. One area where UNDP's institutional processes have clashed with the realities of the delivery of technical assistance in real time has been that of procurement where UNDP's processes have been perceived to be unhelpful. While an improved forecast of events together with better planning could ameliorate some of the institutional difficulties there is always likely to be a tension with directly executed parliamentary support.

Has the Component managed implementation across the various Hluttaws efficiently?

89. Given the absence of a technical assistance team for sub-national work, overall implementation has been as efficient as it could be although there have been higher transaction costs than would otherwise have been the case. The initial decision to centralise work with sub-national Hluttaws was appropriate and the decision that this work will, for the remainder of the CPAP, be delivered mainly through clustered activities is also appropriate.
90. At Union level, the decision to locate the Programme Specialist in Yangon has resulted in considerable inefficiencies – see paragraphs 51 and 75. Whilst it is recognised that the Programme Specialist needs to spend time with the rest of the programme team, efficiencies in overall strategic direction can only be achieved in counterparts not only know who their strategic interlocutor is but also have immediate access to that person on a regular basis.

How have partnerships (especially with IPU and the House of Commons) influenced the efficiency of the Component in delivering against its portfolio?

91. IPU is clearly the most significant implementing partner and UNDP has benefited from this not just in terms of access to knowledge and resources but also through addressing some of the procurement challenges identified in paragraph 88. IPU's ability to be more flexible in its approach to procurement has undoubtedly assisted in ensuring that support can be delivered in a timelier and appropriate way than might otherwise have been the case.
92. The relationship with the House of Commons has added value to the work of the Learning Centre and to the wider work of the Component at Union level through the colocation of both technical assistance teams in the same office and a genuine rapport between the key players.

To what degree has UNDP incorporated and fostered South-South cooperation, knowledge management, and volunteerism and UN coordination in the implementation of this Component? How beneficial have these been?

93. UNDP's fostering of South-South cooperation has been good during the evaluation period with resource people being drawn from a range of appropriate countries. At a practical level, more focus could be given to identifying current and recently transitional legislatures that could be used to provide learning inputs rather than placing a reliance on settled democracies. A move in this direction could make it easier for beneficiaries to understand how they might map possibilities for transition within Myanmar. Additionally, where possible within the limits of existing national capacity, future programming should seek to make use of those with local experience to help extrapolate the application of international experience to that of Myanmar.
94. The State Counsellor's desire, agreed by the JCC, that a group of four implementers should be identified to act as the Development Partners' liaison for any implementers seeking to work with the Union Hluttaw brings with it the challenge of how UNDP can be seen as a facilitator rather than a gatekeeper not least because of its dominant presence within the Hluttaw. It is clearly essential that UNDP is one of the four members of this group, and it will also be appropriate for it to continue its bilateral engagement with the Hluttaw leadership including the JCC, but it would be a significant gesture towards greater collaboration if the internal coordination of this group was led by another organisation.
95. As has already been noted, coordination and collaboration with other UN agencies could be significantly improved. The evidence to date shows that the collaboration that has taken place had tended to be activity focussed rather than being strategically driven. The positive relationships that have been developed with a number of counterparts in other agencies should be leveraged to promote Delivery as One. In this context, the next UNDAF, due to take effect in 2018, will be an opportunity to develop wider UN programming for support to the Hluttaw.
96. The potential conflict of interest for UNDP as both a funder and an implementer is an inevitable tension that has been managed appropriately working with donors. Acting as co-chair of the DIP is appropriate in the current period and it is noted that the TOR provide for a rotating chair. As the number of potential donors and implementers increase, the Evaluation Team believes that UNDP is well-placed to take the lead in reviewing mapping of work in this area given that, as the current CPAP draws to a close there is an increasing number of planned interventions with Hluttaws.

Sustainability

What indications are there that achievements so far will be sustained (e.g. national ownership, national systems and structures, individual capacity)

97. It is too early to identify sustainable impacts, especially for long term elements of the Component's work such as committee development and support for ICT strategy and infrastructure. The initial duration of the CPAP, although extended, in its attempt to comprehensively cover the large range of challenges facing the Union Hluttaw, to a large extent under-emphasized the likely and long-term supply-driven nature of support to the institution in general from all quarters. One impact of the necessary emphasis on the supply side was that the delivery of tangible outputs was extremely slow during early phases. It is usually also necessary to spend time improving the existing structures before introducing significant change. These two factors are best articulated by a UK Department for International Development publication on democratic governance that has been endorsed by all major donors:

“Countries need to start reforms from where they are, and ... donors need to be pragmatic in supporting developing countries to make progress.

Building democratic values and institutions takes time. Democratic institutions ... took centuries to evolve, and even in many relatively democratic countries poor people still feel powerless.”²

98. The need to take a long-term approach to parliamentary development was also acknowledged in a review of development cooperation in Timor-Leste that was commissioned by the Embassy of Norway in 2007:

“States cannot be built on the cheap in a matter of a few years under the best of conditions let alone in the aftermath of violent conflict. Rather, nation and state building are long-term endeavours.”³

99. That said, the technical assistance team at the Union Hluttaw have sought to be proactive in ensuring that there is follow-up with learning participants although this has, to date, been in a rather unstructured way. The Learning Centre should create a bank of resource materials with all learning materials from activities being stored online. These could then be made available for drop-in clients at the Learning Centre together with recordings of all training sessions. Although the Hluttaw does currently record events, the focus is on recording the participants rather than on the presenter and what is displayed on-screen – there is also not enough attempt to ensure that all discussion is audibly captured in the recording.

Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results?

100. While there is some evidence of ownership, it is still too early to judge if this will be sufficient to guarantee sustainability. Steering committees, such as that for the Learning Centre, need to be actively fostered. It should not be assumed that just because counterparts have agreed to the establishment of coordination mechanism such as steering committees that these will happen without active engagement by the Component. Whilst it is recognised that technical steering committees will usually rely on the technical assistance team, there is also a need for support from the Programme Specialist for more strategic steering committees.

Recommendations

² *Governance, Development and Democratic Politics*, UK Department for International Development, 2007, p 20

³ *Review of Development Cooperation in Timor-Leste*, Scanteam, 2007, p 81

- Recommendation 1:** There should be more sustained engagement with counterparts by the programme team with the Union Hluttaw Programme Specialist being based at the Nay Pyi Taw Field Office.
- Recommendation 2:** The Work Plan for the Union Hluttaw until December 2017 should clearly align itself with priorities identified by counterparts and be based on detailed requirements extrapolated from the Strategic Plan's higher level objectives.
- Recommendation 3:** There should be an increased engagement with MPs whilst continuing to focus on consolidating staff learning.
- Recommendation 4:** The current planned level of engagement at Region and State level should be maintained for the remainder of the current CPAP.
- Recommendation 5:** The evaluation plan should be improved to capture information regarding how knowledge learned is applied and what behavioural change has taken place.
- Recommendation 6:** Reporting should be restructured to focus on achievement and be less defensive.
- Recommendation 7:** The technical assistance team for a new CPAP should be modelled on a CTA focused on the Union Hluttaw but with overall responsibility for all parliamentary work and a STA focused on State and Regional Hluttaws.
- Recommendation 8:** There should be three guiding principles for future programming:
- Resource teams and exemplar materials should come from transitional and recently transitional parliaments where possible rather than from settled democracies;
 - International resource teams should assist in understanding how to apply the knowledge they are imparting to the Myanmar context; and
 - Where possible, national Myanmar experience should be utilised.
- Recommendation 9:** UNDP should not coordinate multilateral interventions with the JCC.
- Recommendation 10:** UNDP should take the lead in remapping current and proposed engagement by donors and implementers.
- Recommendation 11:** The Learning Centre should continue to develop a searchable database of all learning activities providing access to learning materials and the ability to participate virtually in activities already delivered.
- Recommendation 12:** There should be a more hands-on approach to building the capacity of steering committees such as that for the Learning Centre.

Lessons Learned

Results Framework

101. The current Output results framework focuses too much on activities. There should be a clearer emphasis on seeking change, with the use of realistic outcomes given the relatively short life of the Component thus far. A results framework for a new Programme should have lower level outcome statements as well as appropriate objectively verifiable indicators that lie within the control of the Component rather than depending on external factors.

Relationships

102. There is little doubt that the Component would not have enjoyed the success that it has had to date, or even been able to operate at all, without a significant investment in building relationships with key counterparts. For understandable reasons, this has been more broad-based at Union level but, if there is to be successful increase in activity at Regional and State level in any new Programme, there must be a similar approach that identifies key drivers for change beyond the Speakers and Directors.

Programme Management

103. Programme Specialists must have a much higher visibility with their counterparts at both Union and Region/State level. This will ensure that strategic direction is given by UNDP in a way that is appropriate and does not blur the boundaries of the technical assistance teams.
104. While the development of the Component was responsive and appropriately flexible during the current Programme, more attention to programme design needs to be given during the development of a new Programme so that there is a clear, and shared, vision of what success will look like and what is realistic within the overall time frame.

Annexes

The following pages contain:

- A. Evaluation Terms of Reference
- B. Inception Report
- C. Meetings conducted
- D. Documents reviewed

A. Evaluation Terms of Reference

United Nations Development Programme



TERMS OF REFERENCE EVALUATION OF THE UNDP PARLIAMENTARY STRENGTHENING OUTPUT OF THE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME IN MYANMAR

Assignment Title	Team Leader: Independent Evaluation
Type of Contract	Individual Contract (International)
Start/End Dates	8 August – 16 September 2016
Estimated working days	25 days
Supervisor	Programme Specialist Parliament
Location	Home-based with travel to Yangon, Nay Pyi Taw and other locations in Myanmar
Country	Myanmar

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

UNDP's Parliamentary Strengthening output is part of UNDP Myanmar's Democratic Governance Programme under the UNDP Myanmar Country Action Plan. The UNDP Democratic Governance Programme supports more open and responsive governance so that the state will be better able to improve the lives of Myanmar's poorest and most vulnerable people, and overturn a legacy of conflict and mistrust in favor of sustainable development and inclusive growth. The official outcome statement of the Democratic Governance Programme is: "Promotion of democratic governance and the rule of law to strengthen democratic institutions and the advancement of human rights." The programme contains four outputs. Along with Parliamentary Strengthening, the programme also has outputs on Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Development Effectiveness and Public Administration. Three evaluations will be done in the Democratic Governance Programme in 2016, two output level evaluations of the Parliamentary Strengthening Output and of the Rule of Law Output and one outcome level evaluation of the Democratic Governance Programme.

Myanmar had been governed by various military dictatorships for all but twelve of the intervening years between gaining independence from British Colonial rule in 1948 and the establishment of a quasi-civilian government in 2008 under a new Constitution. The 2008 Constitution provided a new framework for governance in Myanmar. At the national level, the 2008 Constitution established a legislative branch comprising a Union Assembly (Pyidaungsu Hluttaw) consisting of two chambers – the Pyithu Hluttaw (People's Assembly) with 440 seats and the Amyotha Hluttaw (Nationalities Assembly) with 224 seats. The Pyithu Hluttaw and the Amyotha Hluttaw are generally equal in status. The Constitution provides that the Pyithu Hluttaw shall be "elected on the basis of township as well as population" and the Amyotha Hluttaw "on an equal number of representatives elected from Region and States."

The Constitution also establishes unicameral legislatures in each of the seven states and seven regions within Myanmar for a total of 14 Hluttaws (or Assemblies). The powers of these legislatures are set out in the Region and State Parliament Act.

Elections to the union, state and regional Hluttaws took place for the first time in November 2010. Bi-elections were held in 2012 and the second general election in November 2015. The 2nd Hluttaws commenced their work in February 2016. In both the Union and State and Region Hluttaws, there was large turnover in members between the first and second Hluttaws.

At the time of approval of the new Country Plan in 2013, Myanmar was a country which was emerging from long isolation and military rule, and still facing international sanctions. UNDP had to develop new relationships with state institutions –including parliament, this is an important consideration for the evaluation of this Parliamentary Strengthening Output.

The UNDP Myanmar Parliamentary Strengthening Output statement is “Parliament at Union levels and selected state/ region levels perform their functions.” The Output covers capacity building for the Parliamentarians and the Parliamentary Administration for the Union Hluttaw as well as for the region and state Hluttaws.

Since 2013, UNDP’s Parliamentary Strengthening Output has grown from early capacity building initiatives and relationship building, to supporting the strategic directions and development of the Myanmar Parliament at both national and sub-national level. The first year of programming under the new Country Programme in 2013, sought a balance of immediate activity implementation to develop and strengthen the relationship with the Union Parliament together with work to establish buy in and mechanisms for longer term support at the Union level. Building on from the immediate activities, UNDP supported the Union Hluttaw in developing their own Strategic Plan. It states the vision, mission and core values of the Hluttaw, as well as a ‘roadmap’ of objectives and priority actions that will ensure that achievements will be sustained and built upon in both the first and second Hluttaws.

Strategic development plans have been established by the Hluttaw in the key areas identified by the Strategic Plan including on Committees, ICT, Research, and the Learning Centre (which was established with UNDP support to provide long term capacity building and training and skills development for Parliamentarians and Parliamentary staff). Work plans have been developed in these areas which identify and address priority needs.

The output has focused on implementing the priority activities identified in the Strategic Plan, and workplans under the guidance of the Parliamentary Leadership. The output has also been working with the Parliamentary administration in preparing the transition to the 2nd Myanmar Parliament with a focus on both strengthening and improving services available to MPs and supporting the Parliament in organizing its work in the plenary and committees.

The Inter-Parliamentarian Union is an implementing partner of the output at the Union level and UNDP has been working closely with the House of Commons, UK, and the House of Representatives, Australia, in implementing several of the activities.

Region and State Hluttaws started much later in 2014. Most of the support was mainly focusing on familiarizing Members of Parliament and staff about the separation of powers, the role and function of parliament and the budget process. Support was also provided to the Region and State Hluttaws in preparing for the transition to the 2nd Hluttaws. This includes induction for members and leadership for Speakers. Rather than provide targeted support to individual Region and State Hluttaws, the Output has mainly provided support to all the Region and State Hluttaws through joint events, workshops and trainings rather and through a few targeted pilots, of which the lessons learnt are shared with other Hluttaws.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

In line with the evaluation plan for the UNDP Myanmar Country Office, UNDP is commissioning an evaluation of its Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme. This evaluation comes beyond the halfway point of the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) for the Country Office which covers the period 2013 – 2017 and is intended to provide recommendations for UNDP’s next country programme as well as for the remainder of the programme cycle.

The evaluation will assess progress against the achievement of the output statement “Parliament at Union levels and selected state/ region levels perform their functions.” It is expected to analyze the results to date based on the revised Results and Resources Framework of 2014, assess implementation arrangements and identify lessons learnt. Based on this analysis, the evaluation will provide forward looking recommendations on future programmatic focus areas, size and scope and delivery and implementation mechanisms.

SCOPE

The evaluation’s scope will be all activities; results; strategies; operational measures; monitoring; implementation, management and staffing arrangements of the output. It will consider all work between March 2013 and the start date of the evaluation. It will cover the Union Hluttaw and the Region and State Hluttaws. Due to the fact that it will not be possible to visit all Region and State Hluttaws, a special focus will be put on one Regional Hluttaw, Mandalay, and one State Hluttaw, Mon.

The evaluation is expected to take into consideration, the feedback garnered from Members of Parliament, the Hluttaw administration employees, implementing partners, UNDP staff and management, donor representatives, UNDP programme teams under the democratic governance portfolio and across the other thematic areas of local governance and environmental sustainability.

The evaluation will also look into the application and effectiveness of human rights based approaches and gender results.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be guided by the following questions:

Relevance:

To what extent is UNDP’s work in parliament strengthening, consistent with and responding to emerging national and local policies, priorities and needs of the direct beneficiaries? Is the output positioned to support the vision and priorities of the new parliament?

Are the current focus areas that the output is engaged the most relevant for parliamentary strengthening and institutional development in Myanmar; looking forward are there focus areas which should be expanded; downscaled; or stopped? Is the balance in focus between the Union Parliament and Sub-National Parliaments right?

Effectiveness:

To what extent has progress been made towards the achievement of the output? What has been UNDP’s contribution to change?

What are the key results and changes?

To what extent was the output’s selected method of delivery appropriate to the delivery context, including the partnership with the IPU?

To what extent has progress been made on gender inclusion, women’s equality and empowerment in relation to the output statement and wider Democratic Governance Programme Theory of Change?

Efficiency:

Have resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the output been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results?

Has the output managed implementation across the various Hluttaws efficiently?

How have partnerships (especially with IPU and the House of Commons) influenced the efficiency of the output in delivering against its portfolio?

To what degree has UNDP incorporated and fostered South-South cooperation, knowledge management, and volunteerism and UN coordination in the implementation of this output? How beneficial have these been?

Sustainability:

What indications are there that achievements so far will be sustained (e.g. national ownership, national systems and structures, individual capacity)

Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results?

EXPERTISE REQUIRED

The Evaluation Team will be comprised of two (2) persons with the skills, knowledge and expertise detailed below:

International Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader)

Advanced University degree in law, political science, development studies, economics or an equivalent field;

10 years of experience in international development and/or institutional strengthening;

Proven expertise and experience in conducting several evaluations and project/program assessments;

Knowledge and demonstrable experience in the field of democratic governance and parliament strengthening; including with UNDP is an asset

Technical knowledge and experience in UNDP thematic areas, specifically in parliament strengthening, and cross cutting issues such as gender, rights-based approaches to programming and capacity development is an asset

Prior experience of working in Myanmar on parliament is strongly desirable

Strong analytical skills

Strong interpersonal skills

Ability to work in a multicultural environment

Strong English language skills (both written and spoken)

National Evaluation Consultant (Team Member)

Master's degree in law, political science, development studies or a Bachelor's degree in these (or related) fields with additional 3 years' experience

Knowledge and demonstrable experience in the field of parliament strengthening is desirable

Proven expertise and experience in conducting evaluations and project/programme assessments is highly desirable

Fluency in spoken and written Myanmar language

Excellent command of the English language (written and spoken) is required

Strong analytical skills

Myanmar national

The Team Leader will be responsible for:

Providing overall leadership on the independent evaluation of the UNDP Parliament Strengthening Output based on inputs and insights from the national consultant

Conducting desk reviews of relevant documents and interview with government partners, UN / UNDP staff, donors and other partners

Reviewing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of UNDP's Parliamentary Strengthening Output in Myanmar

Identifying whether or not UNDP has achieved its intended results according to the 2014 Results and Resources Framework (based on the strategic outcomes and work plans)

Ensuring completion of all the deliverables outlined below: evaluation inception report, draft evaluation report, evaluation brief (if required) and final evaluation report

The Team Member will be responsible for:

Providing inputs and insights (based on the context of parliament in Myanmar) to the independent evaluation of UNDP's Parliamentary Strengthening Output in Myanmar

Participating in meetings with governments counterparts, UN/UNDP staff, donors and other partners with the Team Leader

Providing support and assistance to finalize the mission agenda, meetings and required visits

Provide inputs to the deliverables: inception report, draft evaluation report, evaluation brief and final evaluation report

Providing Myanmar language interpretation and translation for meetings as required, in order to ensure clear communication between the international consultant and meeting participants

DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team will be expected to produce the following deliverables:

Evaluation Inception Report: Prior to embarking on the data collection exercise, the evaluation team will be required to prepare an inception report which details the understanding of what is being evaluated and why and the methodology

Draft Evaluation Report: The team will be required to submit a draft evaluation report for review to UNDP to ensure that it meets the required quality criteria.

Evaluation Brief: If required, the team will be requested to present the initial findings and recommendations of the report to UNDP, Myanmar government counterparts, donors, and other parliament development partners, as appropriate.

Final Evaluation Report: Following receipt of UNDP's initial comments, the team will be required to submit a final report which clarifies and addresses any clarifications requested in the initial review.

MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The consultants will report to the Programme Specialist Parliament on a weekly basis as work against deliverables progress. They will be accountable to UNDP on the timeliness and quality of the deliverables.

The consultants will be required to conduct interviews with UNDP staff, parliament, implementing partners, donor representatives, and other parties relevant to this evaluation, as identified by UNDP

The consultants are expected to work closely and collaboratively with UNDP staff in Yangon, Nay Pyi Taw, Mandalay and Mon for the duration of this assignment

UNDP will secure parliament (and other counterpart) cooperation for this assignment, including visas and travel authorization

UNDP will assist in the facilitation of introduction letters and/or requests for meetings upon request with stakeholders and beneficiaries

The consultants will be entitled to apply for reimbursement of costs associated with necessary work-related in-country travel in accordance with UNDP's travel policy

The consultants are responsible for providing their own laptop computers and mobile phones for use during this assignment

UNDP will also provide the following support as appropriate:

Substantive inputs to and quality control of deliverables

Administrative and logistical support with travel and transport arrangements, visas, and processes necessary for successful completion of the assignment

UNDP will arrange the consultants' in-country work-related travel

UNDP will provide office/work space to the consultants while in Myanmar

DUTY STATION

This consultancy will be home-based with mission travel to some of the locations in Myanmar as deemed appropriate for the purpose of this evaluation: Yangon, Nay Pyi Taw, Mandalay and Mon.

The consultants may be required to travel to other locations in Myanmar for the purposes of this evaluation. This will be determined by the Programme Specialist Parliament.

TIMEFRAME

The contract will come into effect on 8 August and end 16 September 2016

The consultant will work for a period of **24 work days** within the dates indicated as per the tentative schedule below:

Home-based work: **3 days**

Preparation for mission, review of background documents

Mission to Myanmar: **14 days**

Field visits, interviews, etc

Presentation of initial findings and recommendations to UNDP and selected audiences

Home-based work: **7 days**

Finalization of report

Submission of final report: 16 September

EVALUATION ETHICS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008) and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System'. See attached annexes for reference.

APPROVAL

This TOR is approved by: Emma Morley, Team Leader, Democratic Governance

B. Inception Report

EVALUATION OF THE UNDP PARLIAMENTARY STRENGTHENING OUTPUT OF THE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME IN MYANMAR

EVALUATION INCEPTION REPORT

15 – 29 August 2016

Evaluation Team:

- Niall Johnston, Team Leader
- Sai Tun Thiha, Team Member

The views expressed in this report are those of the Team Leader and do not necessarily reflect the position of the United Nations Development Programme.

17 August 2016

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

CPAP - Country Programme Action Plan

CTA	- Chief Technical Advisor
the Evaluation	- Evaluation of the Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme
the Project	- Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme
UN	- United Nations
UNDP	- United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	- United Nations Evaluations Group

Map of Republic of the Union of Myanmar⁴



⁴ Source: www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/myanmar.pdf

Basic Programme Data

Country:	Republic of the Union of Myanmar
Activity Name:	Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme
Location of Activity:	National level (Nay Pyi Taw); Mandalay Region (Mandalay); and Mon State (Maw La Myaing).
Key Programme Partners:	Pyidaungsu Hluttaw Pyithu Hluttaw Amyotha Hluttaw Inter-Parliamentary Union
Programme Team Leader:	Mr. Edin Elgsaether
UNDP Core Team:	Philipp Annawitt, Than Soe, Yatu, Warren Cahill, Alex Read, Yin Min Htike, Saw Bwe Doe Aye, Ma Sander
Evaluation Team Members:	Mr. Niall Johnston, Team Leader; and Mr. Sai Tun Thiha, Team Member (from 17 August 2016)

Key Programme Dates:

Myanmar Country Programme Document Design: 2012

Myanmar Country Programme Document Period: January 2013 – December 2015

Extension of Country Programme Document: January 2016 – December 2017

Activity Resources:

2013: USD 490,000

(Core Funding: USD 410,000 + Non-core Funding: USD 80,000)

2014: USD 1,540,000

(Core Funding: USD 1,020,000 + Non-core Funding: USD 520,000)

2015: USD 3,170,000

(Core Funding: USD 670,000 + Non-core Funding: USD 2,500,000)

2016: USD 4,000,000

(Core Funding: USD 550,000 + Non-core Funding: USD 3,450,000)

2017: USD 3,000,000

(Core Funding: USD 550,000 + Non-core Funding: USD 3,950,000)

Total available resources over 5 years: USD 13,700,000

(Core Funding: USD 3,200,000 + Non-core Funding: USD 10,500,000)

Introduction

1. This Evaluation Inception Report is the initial output of the independent Evaluation of the UNDP Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme in Myanmar (the Project). It describes the purpose, scope, and overall approach that will be taken in completing the Evaluation.
2. The evaluation is being undertaken in line with the UNDP Myanmar Country Office evaluation plan as defined in the Country Programme Document (CPD). A two-person team (one international and one national consultant) will undertake the evaluation in accordance with the terms of reference and the agreed work plan. It will involve:
 - an initial analysis of available documentation and reports linked directly to the Project;
 - a two-week in-country mission to undertake consultations with parliament sector actors (15 – 29 August 2016);
 - The presentation of a draft Evaluation Report to UNDP for review by 1 September 2016; and
 - Delivery of the final Evaluation Report by 16 September 2016.

Purpose of the Evaluation

3. This evaluation will:
 - assess progress against the achievement of the output statement “Parliament at Union levels and selected state/ region levels perform their functions.”;
 - identify problems and constraints that have been encountered in project implementation;
 - identify important lessons to be learned from UNDP’s experience; and
 - make recommendations on future Project focus areas, size and scope and delivery and implementation mechanisms.
4. The evaluation comes over halfway through delivery of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for the Country Office, which covers the period 2013 – 2017 and is intended to provide recommendations for UNDP’s next country Programme as well as for the remainder of the Programme cycle.

Scope of the Evaluation

5. The UNDP Parliamentary Strengthening Output of the Democratic Governance Programme in Myanmar forms Output 2 of the UNDP’s the Country Programme Action Plan. The objective of this output is defined as:
“Legislative, oversight, and representation functions performed by Hluttaws at Union and selected state and regional levels institutionalized.”
6. The evaluation’s scope will be all activities; results; strategies; operational measures; monitoring; implementation, management and staffing arrangements of the output. The Evaluation Team will consider all work between March 2013 and the start date of the evaluation. It will cover the Union Hluttaw and the Region and State Hluttaws but, due to the fact that it will not be possible to visit all Region and State Hluttaws, a special focus will be put on one Regional Hluttaw, Mandalay, and one State Hluttaw, Mon. The evaluation will also look into the application and effectiveness of human rights based approaches and gender results.
7. The evaluation will take into consideration the feedback garnered from Members of Parliament, the Hluttaw administration employees, implementing partners, UNDP staff and management, donor representatives, UNDP programme teams under the democratic governance portfolio and across the other thematic areas of local governance and environmental sustainability.

8. It is anticipated that the two-week mission will include consultations in: Nay Pyi Taw, Yangon, Mandalay and Maw La Myaing.

Approach and Methodology

9. This evaluation is intended to provide UNDP with an objective assessment of its work under the output. The assessment will be undertaken against the four key criteria noted in the terms of reference: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

10. The terms of reference detail the scope of work and level of resources to be allocated to this assignment. The duration of the Evaluation is short, totalling 25 input-days. These inputs will cover: planning; preparations; initial document; a two-week in-country mission; reporting; review; and finalisation of the Evaluation documentation (an indicative work plan is provided **Section 4.4**, below).

Approach

11. In seeking to answer the evaluation questions, the Evaluation Team's methodology will be to focus on how well the Project, both in design and delivery, has resulted in a transformation of behaviour that will lead to the desired impacts. This means assessing whether there has been improvement in Knowledge, Understanding, Skills and Attitudes. The sum and process of positive transformation in these four areas leads to Behaviour change – KUSA(B). There are three Domains of Learning that KUSA(B) directly relates to:

- Cognitive or intellectual learning – Knowledge & Understanding
- Psychomotor or Physical learning – Skills Development
- Affective or Emotional learning – Attitude Change

12. Put simply, helping counterparts understand what change is required (K), why it is required (U) and how to do it (S) will, hopefully, result in their valuing the need to do it (A), which will, in turn, bring about behavioural change and, thus, transformation. Enabling a counterpart to value a new perspective or approach as intrinsically better or more advantageous to them is a necessary precursor to consistent application of knowledge, understanding or skill when not operating under close scrutiny or supervision.

13. The big prize in this process is a change in attitude because this is what enables people to decide to use and deploy what they know and what they can do – without external pressure. A key question will be whether the Project focuses on the transformation processes as emphasis on this allows stakeholders to see how behaviour is changing over a period of time. By monitoring this, it is possible to assess whether interventions are effective or need to be re-tailored as the programme proceeds rather than merely recording whether specific targets have been met. This emphasis on measuring changes is reinforced by recent European Commission work on performance indicators for parliamentary support.⁵ Monitoring the behavioural change also provides incentives for beneficiaries as they see transformation starting to happen within their institution.

14. The importance of the transformation process can also be seen in any analysis of the drivers for change in an institution, one example of which is the need to develop the political will that will be required to enable change and prevent barriers being placed in the way of progress. In other words, it is not enough that capacity is developed, that increased capacity must be put to use. For example, it might be that parliamentary research capacity is developed but without the willingness of individuals to use this to influence policy and exercise robust oversight, there will be no change of behaviour and, therefore, no transformation. In such circumstances, although it might be possible to say that the activity target had been met, there would have been no transformation and so no impact.

⁵ Strengthening democracy support to EU Delegations: from performance indicators, knowledge sharing to expert services, EIDHR, 2012, p 6

15. Of course, such a transformation process is not automatic and the entire KUSA(B) approach to capacity development needs to be undertaken at each stage in the process to ensure that the linkages between each step do lead to transformation. The linkages apply equally in the opposite direction with changes of behaviour amongst political and administrative leaderships providing an enabling environment for others to change behaviour and so allow transformation.

16. An *evaluation matrix* had been developed (**Annex One**) based on the detailed terms of reference developed by UNDP. The matrix identifies the key evaluation questions and how these will be answered in the evaluation process.

17. To achieve valuable results the Evaluation Team will need to work closely with UNDP staff in Myanmar to: maximise participation; identify relevant information and data sources; and enable efficient implementation of the evaluation. Conversely, the Team will also need to ensure that actual and perceived independence is not compromised so that participants in the evaluation are comfortable with providing fair and frank feedback on the Project.

18. Furthermore, the Evaluation Team will ensure that all those participating in the evaluation are treated with respect and dignity. Care will be taken to provide stakeholders with interview environments that allow for open discussion and reflection on the Project. The Evaluation Team will open each interview with a clear and concise description of the purpose of the evaluation and the use of information and opinions provided, including their confidential nature. Evaluation participants will also be: given the time and information to decide whether or not they wish to participate in the evaluation process; and able to make an independent decision without any influence or pressure to participate.

Methodology

19. The methodology that the Evaluation Team will adopt is constrained by the timeframe available for the evaluation. Activities undertaken throughout the evaluation will meet with the Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, be informed by the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, and comply with the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

20. It is proposed that four key data sources will be used as the basis for data collection and subsequent triangulation of evaluation results. These are:

- i. *Project document review* - review of documents prepared by the Project and UNDP and used to provide evidence against the evaluation criteria.⁶
- ii. *Semi-structured Interviews* - these will be conducted based on a small number of standardised initial questions, which will be developed to elicit responses that address the evaluation criteria.
- iii. *Discussions* - will use open questioning techniques to elicit more qualitative and contextualised information from interviewees. If group discussions are held, the Evaluation Team will endeavour to ensure that gender and cultural considerations are taken into account when structuring these interactions.
- iv. *Review of additional data and reports* - analysis of other relevant documentation, research and international data (where available) will be undertaken to provide additional perspectives on the context relating to parliamentary strengthening in Myanmar.

21. The Evaluation Team's approach to the analysis of the data and feedback gathered will, where possible, be triangulated using multiple sources so that the Team will be able to effectively analyse and verify the information received. The initial document review will provide key information, which will be used to formulate questions for interviews and information gathering. Information and opinions elicited from interviewees will be crosschecked

⁶ A list of documentation provided to the Evaluation Team for this assignment is found in **Annex Two**.

against other information, both written and oral, elicited during the fieldwork, and verification of assumptions will be conducted with interviewees. The fieldwork schedule will need to be sufficiently flexible to allow for follow-up meetings to clarify assumptions or specific information.

22. Conclusions will be reached based on a cross checking of quantitative and qualitative data compiled. Quantitative and qualitative data will be crosschecked against as many data sources as possible. Interview techniques will be adopted which ensure that qualitative information obtained during interviews can be verified, either through a dot point summary, or through an oral summation and clarification of understandings and assumptions made during the interview. In this way, the validity of the data collected and the credibility of the findings based on that data will be maximised.

Crosscutting issues

23. The Evaluation Team will integrate crosscutting issues in to its assessment, particularly with regards to how well the Project interventions have supported parliamentary strengthening initiatives that reflect the needs of diverse groups, especially women and vulnerable groups. Additionally, consideration will be given to whether and how effectively the Project has used human rights-based approach concepts. Based on this assessment, and the findings resulting from it, crosscutting issues will be reflected in the Evaluation Report.

Indicative Work Plan

24. Based on the terms of reference for the assignment, and initial discussions with UNDP, current timeframes for the various aspects of the evaluation are as follows:

Activity / Task	Indicative Timing
Undertaking document review, developing evaluation design, and drafting Evaluation Inception Report.	10 – 14 August
In-country Mission:	
- <i>Yangon</i> : Consultations with UNDP, donors, UN partners, and other stakeholders.	15 – 17 August
- <i>Maw La Myaing</i> : Consultation with Project counterparts and beneficiaries.	18 – 19 August
- <i>Nay Pyi Taw</i> : Consultations with key Project stakeholders and counterparts.	22 – 25 August
- <i>Mandalay</i> : Consultations with key Project stakeholders and counterparts.	26 August
- <i>Yangon</i> : Wrap-up consultations and debriefing with UNDP management.	27 – 29 August
Analysis of data collected, preparation of draft report, and submission of Draft evaluation Report.	30 August – 1 September
Finalisation of the evaluation report, and submission of Final Evaluation Report.	2 – 16 September

Limitations

25. The Union and Region/State Hluttaws are very much nascent institution and the changes in the political environment from 2012 into 2013 mean that, unusually, there is an almost complete lack of baseline information from the beginning. There would normally have been a project design and inception phase before the commencement of full project delivery but political and strategic imperatives meant that there was no time for this to happen. The fact that there was not required a process of establishing trust and relationships before it was possible to start working on the KUSAB process as outlined. In many ways, this is

similar to other governance projects in Myanmar and whether different projects are succeeding depends to a large scale on establishing those relations and being able to build ownership by the counterpart. All that being said, the consequence for the evaluation is that many key documents that would be of assistance in determining the efficacy of project design are either not in existence or have, to some extent, been retro-fitted.

26. The evaluation will be also limited by a number of other factors. The Evaluation Team will address these limitations using a practical approach. Potential limitations, with proposed responses to each, are noted below and include: *Availability of baseline and implementation data* - where baseline data is not available, the Evaluation Team will look to use available implementation data and secondary data sources to assess trends.

- *Evaluation Team composition* - the Evaluation Team were unable to carry out a joint desk review and draft this Inception Report as the second team member has not, at the time of writing, been appointed.
- *Availability of interviewees* - a level of flexibility in the field work schedule will be needed to allow for additional or follow-up meetings to be held, if required.
- *Overall time constraints* - the Evaluation Team will adopt a flexible work approach. Timing-related considerations include: availability of interviewees; issues with local travel arrangements; the inability to visit all areas where Project activities have been implemented; and provision of feedback. Should any serious constraints arise, the situation will be brought to UNDP's attention immediately for discussion and resolution so that the effectiveness of the Evaluation can nonetheless be maximised.

Evaluation Report

27. The Evaluation Team will use the combined data and insights gathered during the document review and from the activities undertaken during the in-country Mission to inform the preparation of the draft Evaluation Report. The draft Evaluation Report will be guided by the UNDP's *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*, in particular Annex 7 of the Handbook relating to evaluation report template and quality standards. The draft Evaluation Report will be submitted to UNDP for review and feedback by 1 September following an exit briefing on 29 August. The Evaluation Team will submit a Final Evaluation Report incorporating relevant feedback by 16 September 2016.

Annex One - Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions ⁷	Specific Sample Sub-questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators / Success	Standard Methods for Data Analysis
Relevance:	To what extent is UNDP's work in parliament strengthening, consistent with and responding to emerging national and local policies, priorities and needs of the direct beneficiaries? Is the output positioned to support the vision and priorities of the new parliament?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was project support aligned with parliament's articulated needs? Are planned interventions still appropriate in light of the new parliament's priorities and policies? 	Project documentation; implementation partners; beneficiaries of activities; and UNDP counterparts	Desk review, stakeholder consultations including self-evaluations, and secondary data sources	As identified in the Resources and Results Framework	<p>Qualitative data - will be analysed based on a three-step process, namely:</p> <p>i) reducing the data so that patterns, observations, or 'themes' that repeatedly appear in the data can be identified;</p> <p>ii) presentation of the data in a clear and concise manner (potentially graphically, where possible or appropriate) so that patterns or themes can be easily grasped by the reader; and</p> <p>iii) developing findings or conclusions based on the implications of the data collected and analysed. Where possible the</p>
	Are the current focus areas that the output is engaged the most relevant for parliamentary strengthening and institutional development in Myanmar; looking forward are there focus areas which should be expanded; downscaled; or stopped? Is the balance in focus between the Union Parliament and Sub-National Parliaments right?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the project aligned with current UNDP programme in Myanmar? Alignment between project outputs and CPAP outcomes? How was project development conducted? 				
Effectiveness:	To what extent has progress been made towards the achievement of the output? What has been UNDP's contribution to change?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have defined outputs been achieved or is progress being made towards achieving these? What attitudinal changes have occurred in first-level beneficiaries? Perceptions of the quality of support provided by the project? Have activity evaluations taken place? If yes, how do they feed into planning future activities? 				

⁷ As defined in the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation.

	What are the key results and changes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have activities extending into the informal justice- space provided support to minorities, etc. in realising their rights? • Have results been realised with regards to <i>institutional performance</i> in partner / stakeholder organisations? • Have results been realised with regards to <i>individual capacity</i> in partner / stakeholder organisations? 			As identified in the (revised) Resources and Results Framework	quantitative data will be triangulated against other data sources.
	To what extent was the output's selected method of delivery appropriate to the delivery context, including the partnership with the IPU?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do IPU and project interact at planning level? • What are the determinants for delivery methods? 				Quantitative data - will be analysed using relevant arithmetic approaches. The method of presentation will be selected to facilitate reader's understanding of the results and may include: simple graphic representation of numeric data in charts, use of percentages, tabulation, or weighted distribution where responses are weighted and ranked.
	To what extent has progress been made on gender inclusion, women's equality and empowerment in relation to the output statement and wider Democratic Governance Programme Theory of Change?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has change been organisational or attitudinal? • What evidence is there of mainstreaming and/or inclusion? 				
Efficiency:	Have resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the output been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity in the definition and planning of the project? • Timeliness in the delivery of outputs? • Efficiency in the use of UNDP and external human resources? • Balance between expenditure on technical service delivery and managerial support? 				
	Has the output managed implementation across the various Hluttaws efficiently?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What identifiable benefit (cost savings, improved speed of delivery, higher quality technical support) have resulted from UNDP partnering with other UN agencies and/or other organisations? • Was the management of the project responsive to changing needs? • Did the project suffer from delays in 				

		implementation? If so, why and what was done about it?				
	How have partnerships (especially with IPU and the House of Commons) influenced the efficiency of the output in delivering against its portfolio?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are partners' goals in alignment with UNDP? • What would be the impact of not having the partnerships? • Do partnerships reduce or increase transaction costs? 				
	To what degree has UNDP incorporated and fostered South-South cooperation, knowledge management, and volunteerism and UN coordination in the implementation of this output? How beneficial have these been?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which South-South cooperation has been undertaken? • What changes have resulted from undertaking / participating in South-South cooperation activities? 				
Sustainability :	What indications are there that achievements so far will be sustained (e.g. national ownership, national systems and structures, individual capacity)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What examples exist of UNDP's activities being: independently undertaken by partner / stakeholder organisations; and/or receiving non-UNDP funding support? • Are there any actions that can be taken now that will increase the likelihood that the project's outcomes will be sustainable? 				
	Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have changes with regards to <i>institutional performance</i> (if any) been fully embedded in the relevant institution / organisation? And are funding / resources in place to support these changes after the completion of the project? • Have changes with regards to <i>individual capacity</i> (if any) been fully embedded in the relevant institution / organisation? • Are there any areas of the project that are clearly not sustainable? 				

Annex Two - Documentation Provided for the Document Review

HLUTTAW DOCUMENTS

Committee List

Committee Laws

Constitution of Myanmar – 2008

Rules of Procedure – Pyithu Hluttaw

Second Hluttaw: Leadership & Professional Development for Committee Chairs, Secretaries & Members – Programme

Second Hluttaw: Leadership & Professional Development for Committee Chairs, Secretaries & Members – Briefing for International MPs

Strategic Plan

Terms of Reference – Government's Guarantees, Pledges and Undertakings Assessment Committee – Amyotha Hluttaw

Terms of Reference – Hluttaw Rights Committee – Amyotha Hluttaw

Terms of Reference – Bill Committee – Pyithu Hluttaw

Terms of Reference – Public Accounts Committee – Pyithu Hluttaw

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Annual Work Plans – 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016

Committee Development Plan

Concept note: Second Hluttaw Orientation, Induction and Ongoing Professional Development of MPs

ICT Strategy

Induction 2016 – Evaluation Summary

Induction 2016 – Programme

Learning Centre Strategy Paper

Survey of Myanmar Members of Parliament: Reflections from the First Hluttaw

PROGRESS REPORTS

Annual Project Progress Review Reports – 2014 and 2015

Output Board Minutes – January and September 2014

Output Board Reports – 2014 and 2015

Quarterly Project Progress Review Reports – 2014, 2015 and 2016 (Q1)

UNDP DOCUMENTS

Country Action Plan – Midterm Evaluation – 2015

Democratic Governance Analysis – 2013

Draft Results and Resources Framework (Pillar 3 – Democratic Governance) – 2016

Theory of Change – 2013

EVALUATION GUIDANCE

UNEG – Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation – 2008

UNDP – Evaluation Policy – 2011

UNDP – Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators – 2002

UNDP – Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results – 2009

UNDP – Outcome Level Evaluation – 2011

C. Persons Consulted

UNION PARLIAMENT MEMBERS

U Htun Htun Hein	Chair of Bills Committee, Chair of WIPA, Pyithu Hluttaw
Dr.Zaw Lin Htut	Joint Coordination Committee
Daw Su Su Lwin	Chair of WIPA, Pyithu Hluttaw and First Lady of Myanmar
U Zaw Min	Amyotha Hluttaw
Daw Aye Aye Mu	Joint Coordination Committee
U Saw Moe Myint	Joint Coordination Committee
U Aung Kyi Nyunt	Deputy Chair, Joint Coordination Committee
Lt Col Ye Naing Oo	MP, Amyotha Hluttaw
Daw Naw Hla Hla Soe	Joint Coordination Committee
U Zung Hiei Thang	Chair, Inter-Parliamentary Friendship and Collaboration Committee, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Mya Thaung	Chair of Committee for Women and Children's Rights, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Zaw Thein	Chair, International Relations Committee, Pyithu Hluttaw
U Maung Toe	Former MP and former Secretary, Public Accounts Committee, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw, now Commissioner, Commission for Assessment of Legal Affairs and Special Issues
Daw Wint War Tun	Joint Coordination Committee
U Win Thein Zaw	MP, Investment and Development Committee, Pyithu Hluttaw

UNION PARLIAMENT OFFICIALS

U Tin Win Aung	Director General, Pyithu Hluttaw
Daw Ni Ni Aye	Deputy Director, International Relations Department, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
U Thiha Han	Deputy Director General, Research, Public Relations and International Relations Department, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Zaw Hein	Deputy Director General of Research, International Relations, ICT and Library Department, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
U Zaw Than Htike	Director of ICT, Amyotha Hluttaw
Daw Aye Aye Khine	Deputy Director, International Relations Department, Pyithu Hluttaw
Daw Nant Aye Aye Kyi	Deputy Director General, Legislation Department, Pyithu Hluttaw
U Kyi Min	Director General, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Myat Moe	Director, International Relations and Research Department, Pyithu Hluttaw
Daw Aye Aye Myat	Deputy Director, Research, Public Relations and International Relations, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Ye Myint	Director of Committees, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Than Phyo Naing	Director of Committees, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
Daw Aye Aye Nyein Nyein	Assistant Director, Speaker's Office, Amyotha Hluttaw
Daw Thi Thi Nwe	Deputy Director General of Legislation Department, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
U Khin Maung Oo	Deputy Director General, Administration and Finance, Pyithu Hluttaw
U Lwin Oo	Deputy Director General, Committee Department, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Than Zaw Oo	Deputy Director of ICT, Pyithu Hluttaw
U Kyaw Soe	Permanent Secretary, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
U Kyaw Kyaw Soe	Deputy Director, Joint Bill Committee, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
Dr Myatt Soe	Director of Research Department, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
U Min Zaw Soe	Deputy Director, Meetings Department, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
Daw Htar Su Su Kyaw	Deputy Director of Research, Public Relations and International Relations, Amyotha Hluttaw
U Kyi Thein	Deputy Director General, Administration Department, Pyithu Hluttaw
Daw Thida Tun	Deputy Director General, Speaker's Office, Amyotha Hluttaw

U Kyaw Naing Tun	Deputy Director of ICT, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
U Myo Win	Director of Meetings Department, Pyithu Hluttaw

REGIONAL AND STATE PARLIAMENT MEMBERS

U Tun Min Aung	Chair, Ethnic Affairs Committee & Chairperson, Government pledges, Guarantees and Undertakings Vetting Committee, Mon State
U Tin Aung	Chair, Legislative Committee, Mandalay
U Maung Maung Aye	Chair, Transportation, Communication, and Construction Committee, Mandalay
Daw Tin Ei	Speaker, Mon State
U Thinn Hlaing	Former Speaker of Sagaing Region and now UNDP consultant on regions & states ⁸
Dr Khin Maung Htay	Deputy Speaker, Mandalay Region
U Aye Khaine	Chair, Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation Committee, Mandalay
Dr Chit Ko Ko	Chair, Economic and Commerce Affairs Committee, Mandalay
U Aung Kyi	Chair, Local Planning, Budget and Finance Committee, Mandalay
Daw Khaing Khaing Leh	Chair, Legislative Committee, Mon State
U Zaw Mg	Chair, Public Affairs Committee, Mandalay
U Myint Aung Moe	Secretary, Security, Management and Municipal Committee, Mandalay
U Aung Kyaw Oo	Speaker, Mandalay Region
Dr Kyaw Oo	Chair, National Races Affairs Committee, Mandalay
U Aung Naing Oo	Deputy Speaker, Mon State
U Myint Swe	Chair, Agriculture and Livestock Affairs Committee, Mandalay
U Saw Thauing Tin	Chair, Hluttaw Representative Vetting Committee, Mandalay
U Aung Kyaw Thu	Chair, Complaints, Petitions, Proposals and General Affairs Assessment Committee, Mon State
U Aung Thu	Secretary, Religion, Social and Cultural Affairs Committee, Mandalay
U Aung Than Tun	Chair, Public Finance Expenditure Vetting Committee, Mandalay
U Hlaing Win	Member, Industrial, Energy and Electricity Affairs Committee, Mandalay

REGIONAL AND STATE PARLIAMENT OFFICIALS

U Nay Myo Aung	Director, Mon State
Daw Khin Myint Cho	Deputy Director, Mon State
Daw Khin Mya Mya	Director, Mandalay Region

LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS

Joe Fisher	International Development Liaison Officer, Office of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi
U Pe Aung Lin	Chair, MCERP

EMBASSIES AND INTERNATIONAL MISSIONS

Omar Dawoodjee	Policy Advisor, Norway
Ye Wana Hlaing	Commercial Officer, Denmark
David Holmertz	Counsellor – Development, Sweden
Mitchell O'Brien	Parliamentary Strengthening Cluster Team Leader, WBG
Zoe Oliver-Watts	House of Commons, UK
Andrea Sawka	Director, Office of Democracy and Governance, USAID
Maria Suokko	Deputy Head of Mission and Head of Development Cooperation, Sweden
Kwoko Yokosuka	Governance Programme Manager, DFAT

INGOs

Darin Bielicki	Resident Program Officer, IRI
----------------	-------------------------------

⁸ The Evaluation Team recognises that there is a possibility of a perception of a conflict of interest in information provided by this individual as he is now engaged by UNDP. Having compared his information regarding his former role with that provided by others, the Evaluation Team is satisfied that no actual conflict of interest exists in the context of the Evaluation.

Jacquelien Corcoran	Asia Senior Adviser, NDI
Scott Hubli	Director of Governance Programs, NDI
Pascalene Krone	Deputy Chief of Party, IFES
Franklin De Vrieze	Incoming Technical Advisor, Westminster Foundation for Democracy
Elizabeth Weir	Parliamentary Consultant, NDI
Ans Zwerver	Senior Country Director, NDI

IPU

Ye Thura Aung	National Project Officer
Norah Babic	Programme Officer
Oakkar Maung	ICT Manager

UNDP

Philipp Annawitt	Programme Specialist, Regional and State Parliaments
Daw Hlaing Yu Aung	Programme Assistant
Charles Chauvel	Team Leader, Inclusive Political Processes, BPSS
Anki Dellnas	Programme Specialist, Local Development
Edin Elgsaether	Programme Specialist, Parliament
Dilrukshi Fonseka	Social Cohesion and Governance Specialist
Toily Kurbanov	Former Country Director
Hyeran Kim	Programme Specialist, Development Planning and Effectiveness
Daw Ni Ni Lwin	Field Coordinator, Mon State
Dania Marzouki	Programme Specialist, Monitoring and Evaluation
Mascha Matthews	Output Lead, Rule of Law
Allison Moore	Programme Specialist, Civil Society and Media
Emma Morley	Team Leader, Democratic Governance
Dr Than Soe	Programme Analyst, Parliament
Frank Thomas	Programme Specialist, Development Planning and Effectiveness

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TEAM

U Saw Bwe Doe Aye	Learning Centre Manager
Daw Mra Chaw Su Aye	UNDP Programme Analyst, Public Administration and former National Officer
Warren Cahill	Chief Technical Advisor
Frank Feulner	Former parliamentary consultant on regions and states
Grant Harrison	Former Australian MP
Daw Yin Min Htike	National Officer
U Min Lawe	Knowledge Development Consultant
Meg Munn	Former UK MP
U Kyaw Thet Naing	Senior Trainer, Learning Centre
Paulene Ng	Former Secretary-General, Legislative Council of Hong Kong
Alex Read	Learning Centre Specialist
Caitlin Reiger	Former Chief Technical Advisor, UNDP Rule of Law

D. Key Documents Reviewed

HLUTTAW DOCUMENTS

2nd Hluttaw: Leadership & Professional Development for Committee Chairs, Secretaries & Members – Programme
 2nd Hluttaw: Leadership & Professional Development for Committee Chairs, Secretaries & Members – Briefing for International MPs
 2nd Hluttaw: Committee List
 Committee Laws
 Constitution of Myanmar – 2008
 Rules of Procedure – Pyithu Hluttaw
 Strategic Plan
 Terms of Reference – Government's Guarantees, Pledges and Undertakings Assessment Committee – Amyotha Hluttaw
 Terms of Reference – Joint Committees – Pyidaungsu Hluttaw
 Terms of Reference – Hluttaw Rights Committee – Amyotha Hluttaw
 Terms of Reference – Bill Committee – Pyithu Hluttaw
 Terms of Reference – Public Accounts Committee – Pyithu Hluttaw
 Translation – Regional or State Hluttaw Law – 2013 Union Assembly Law No. 22

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

Annual Work Plans – 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016
 Committee Development Plan
 Committee Oversight Workshops in Mandalay, Sagaing, Kachin, and Mon – Mission Report – 2015
 Concept Note: UNDP's Proposed Support to the Region and State Hluttaws – 2016
 Concept Note: Community Outreach and Dialogue of Region and State Hluttaws
 Concept Note: Second Hluttaw Orientation, Induction and Ongoing Professional Development of MPs
 Data Centre Agreement
 ICT Strategy
 Induction 2016 – Evaluation Summary
 Induction 2016 – Programme
 Leadership Programme for Speakers and Deputy Speakers of Region and State Hluttaws Yangon & Hong Kong – Report
 Learning Centre Development Plans
 Learning Centre Strategy Paper
 Learning Centre Training Calendar – 2016-2017
 Monthly Reports by Sub-national Parliamentary Expert – January and March 2013
 Progress Reports on the Development of Strategic Plans for the Hluttaws of Mandalay Region, Sagaing Region, Kachin State and Mon State – 2015
 Survey of Myanmar Members of Parliament: Reflections from the First Hluttaw

PROGRESS REPORTS

Annual Project Progress Review Reports – 2014 and 2015
 Output Board Minutes – January and September 2014
 Output Board Reports – 2014 and 2015
 Quarterly Project Progress Review Reports – 2014, 2015 and 2016 (Q1)

UNDP DOCUMENTS

Back to Office Report – Charmaine Rodrigues – 2012
 Briefing Sheet – Mandalay Region
 Briefing Sheet – Mon State
 Country Programme Action Plan – 2013-2015

Country Action Plan – Midterm Evaluation – 2015
Democratic Governance Analysis – 2013
Draft Results and Resources Framework (Pillar 3 – Democratic Governance) – 2016
Democratic Governance Programme Theory of Change – 2013
Project Proposal – Immediate Support to the Myanmar Parliament – 2012

INGOs

ICG - Myanmar's New Government - Finding Its Feet? – 2016
IPU – Common Principles for Support to Parliaments – 2015
IPU – Parliamentary Needs Assessment Report – 2012
NDI – Burma Pre-Election Technical Assessment – 2015
TAF – Administering the State in Myanmar - An Overview of the General Administration Department – 2014
WBG –Modernization of Public Financial Management in Myanmar Project Appraisal Document – 2014

EVALUATION GUIDANCE

UNEG – Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation – 2008
UNDP – Evaluation Policy – 2011
UNDP – Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators – 2002
UNDP – Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results – 2009
UNDP – Outcome Level Evaluation – 2011