

## ANNEX 2 MTR Evaluative Matrix and examples of questions used for data collection

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
<b>Project Strategy</b>				
<b>Project Design</b>				
1.	Are the original problem analysis, project objective and the assumptions identified in the ProDoc still relevant and comprehensive?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity and completeness/gaps in problem analysis, barriers analysis and assumptions in ProDoc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• Forest Department/NWCD staff</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Secondary literature on Myanmar</li> </ul>
2.	Is the project building on and enhancing results and lessons from other relevant projects, especially PA establishment/management and PA system development work in Myanmar and global best practice?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with past work on PAs in Myanmar</li> <li>• Continuity of development of Myanmar's PA system and PA management capacity</li> <li>• WCPA guidelines (as embedded in project design and monitoring)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Forest Department/NWCD staff</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• Others working in this space eg WWF, FFI &amp; reviewer's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
3.	Is the project concept in line with national priorities for biodiversity conservation and PA planning and management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment with MONREC policies, strategies &amp; plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MONREC policies, strategies &amp; plans</li> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Key informants from MONREC, UNDP &amp; WCS including GEF OFP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
4.	Were the perspectives of stakeholders and decision-makers adequately taken into account in the project design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Records of stakeholder groups consulted during PPG and of actual consultations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• PPG Report</li> <li>• Key informants from different stakeholder groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
5.	To what extent were relevant gender issues taken into account during the project design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coverage of gender issues in the project strategy</li> <li>• Gender disaggregated indicators and baseline data in the Results Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Results Framework</li> <li>• Progress Reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Other project reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>	
6.	To what extent have project risks been correctly and consistently identified along with appropriate risk mitigation and management measures including externalities such as climate change and political changes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The risks identified at the start of project</li> <li>• Monitoring &amp; updating of risks during project implementation</li> <li>• Extent to which identified risks capture problems encountered during implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP Environmental and Social Screening</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• WCS, MONREC &amp; UNDP staff</li> <li>• Community members in field sites</li> <li>• Other CSOs working in Myanmar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
7.	Are there any major areas of concern / areas for improvement regarding the original project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall assessment of the project based on analysis of the progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management and sustainability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTR findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and synthesis of all MTR findings</li> </ul>
<b>Results Framework/Logframe</b>				
8.	Is the Project Results Framework logical comprehensive and realistic and are the indicators and targets SMART and relevant to planned outcomes with complete baselines ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness and coherence of Results Framework</li> <li>• Alignment of Results Framework with Project Strategy narrative</li> <li>• Ability to measure progress towards outcomes (i.e. quality of indicators, baselines and targets)</li> <li>• Systematic monitoring of indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Results Framework</li> <li>• Progress Reports/PIRs</li> <li>• SMART patrolling reports</li> <li>• Other monitoring reports</li> <li>• Tracking tools</li> <li>• Other project reports</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• In-depth discussions with WCS project team</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
9.	Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of progress on delivery of outcomes and objectives</li> <li>• Implementation challenges reported in progress reports and/or project partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Other reports</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• In-depth Interviews with project partners and other stakeholders</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
10.	Are there any benefits of the project, which are not reflected in the logframe or captured by the indicators and in the progress reporting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presence of unexpected positive outcomes and impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
11.	Is project monitoring adequately capturing gender and broader development aspects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meaningful indicators for gender and development integrated in Results Framework and effectively monitored</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results Framework</li> <li>• Progress Reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Monitoring reports</li> <li>• Tracking tools</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Progress Towards Results</b>				
<b>Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis</b>				
12.	What has been the progress towards planned targets for the outcome and objective indicators in the Results Framework?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator achievement versus milestones and targets (mid-term and completion)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Results Framework</li> <li>• Progress Reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Other monitoring reports</li> <li>• Tracking tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Assessment using Progress Towards Results Matrix and following UNDP-GEF Guidance for MTRs</li> </ul>
13.	What changes have taken place since the start of the project in relation to capacity development, PA system financing and PA management effectiveness in the 4 demonstration sites?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current status compared to baseline</li> </ul>	Tracking tools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity Development Scorecard</li> <li>• Financial Capacity Scorecard</li> <li>• PA Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Hkakaborazi NP, Hponkanrazi WS, Htamanthi WS, Hukaung Valley WS</li> <li>• Supporting evidence from Project Team and MONREC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
14.	What are the main barriers affecting the project's ability to achieve its intended results (outcomes and objectives)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obstacles to PA establishment and management in Myanmar identified by key stakeholders</li> <li>• Analysis of other MTR findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff, particularly NWCD including NPD</li> <li>• Community members</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• UNESCO staff in Myanmar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
15.	What are the main successes and achievements of the project, and how can the project further expand these benefits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results, which are on or above target</li> <li>• Unplanned benefits/results as reported by key stakeholders and/or in project progress reports and reasons for these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
<b>Project Implementation and Adaptive Management</b>				
<b>Management Arrangements</b>				
16.	How effective and efficient has project management and execution by WCS, MONREC and UNDP been?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity, transparency and timeliness of decision-making and reporting processes (e.g. responsibilities of each of the three project partners, reporting lines, Project Board structure, TORs, frequency of meetings, role of TAGPA, PMC)</li> <li>• Nature and rationale for any significant changes made to project strategy and/or implementation</li> <li>• Candor and realism in annual reporting</li> <li>• Adequate focus on results/impacts</li> <li>• Quality of risk reporting &amp; mitigation &amp; management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Project Board meeting minutes</li> <li>• Other monitoring reports</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP project managers</li> <li>• NPD</li> <li>• Project Board members from UNDP and MONREC</li> <li>• Forest Department field staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>
17.	How effective has UNDP been at providing support and guidance to the WCS Project Team and MONREC?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature and frequency of UNDP oversight</li> <li>• Types of guidance provided and clarity of guidance</li> <li>• Responsiveness to requests from Project Team or MONREC (funds disbursement, technical support, political support to overcome challenges, etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• Project Reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
<b>Work Planning</b>				
18.	Has implementation been timely?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delays in start-up and implementation</li> <li>• Reason for any delays</li> <li>• Rate of progress towards planned targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Project Board Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
19.	Are work-planning processes results-based?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual workplans that are clearly linked to outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> </ul>
20.	Is the project's results framework used as an effective management tool?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number and nature of reviews/updates to Results Framework in response to changes in implementation context</li> <li>• Alignment between Results Framework and Annual Workplans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Results Framework</li> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Finance and Co-finance</b>				
21.	Are project activities implemented in a cost-effective manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of implementing partners and stakeholders own resources and capacities</li> <li>• Strategic use of co-financing</li> <li>• Appropriateness of budget allocations to different planned outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> <li>• Audit reports</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Project Board Meeting minutes</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• Forest Department staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
22.	Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variance between planned and actual expenditure explained satisfactorily</li> <li>• Budget revisions are appropriate and relevant</li> <li>• No significant audit findings on financial management and expenditures</li> <li>• Budgets are clear and easy to understand &amp; output based</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> <li>• Audit reports</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
23.	Is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-financing complements/contributes to existing plans and priorities of the partners</li> <li>• Alignment and effective use of co-financing ensured through annual workplanning and budgeting processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial statements</li> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Complete co-financing monitoring table with inputs from WCS, MONREC and UNDP</li> </ul>
<b>Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems</b>				
24.	Is the monitoring system appropriate, effective and participatory?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature and quality of monitoring processes</li> <li>• Alignment of monitoring systems with good practice and national systems</li> <li>• Project partners / staff involved in monitoring</li> <li>• Types, quality and use of monitoring data to inform project implementation &amp; management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring processes &amp; tracking tools</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Baseline information</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
25.	Are sufficient financial resources allocated to M&E and are these used effectively or are additional tools and resources required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of resources allocated to M&amp;E</li> <li>• Effectiveness of M&amp;E tools and processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial statements</li> <li>• Annual workplans and budgets</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>				
26.	Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct & tangential stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key stakeholder groups (national &amp; subnational government, Forest Department, other MONREC departments, PA staff, CSOs, communities) are actively engaging with the project and supportive of project objectives</li> <li>• Number of partnerships/collaborations with other CSOs on relevant issues</li> <li>• Extent of public participation and awareness about the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• PAMCC meeting minutes</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• GAD staff of Kachin State and Sagaing Region, including at district &amp; township levels</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Reporting</b>				
27.	Is project reporting sufficient, appropriate and adding value to project delivery?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptive management changes reported to the Project Board (major ones presented to Board for approval)</li> <li>• Quality of PIR and Quarterly progress reporting including PIR ratings and response to PIR ratings</li> <li>• Documentation, internalization and sharing of project lessons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Project Board meeting minutes</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Communications</b>				
28.	Is there effective communication with internal and external project communication with different stakeholder groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication strategy</li> <li>• Frequency and clarity of communication with different stakeholder groups at national and subnational levels, including within MONREC</li> <li>• Mechanisms of external communication /public outreach and awareness generation and their effectiveness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prodoc</li> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• Project Board meeting minutes</li> <li>• Communication materials</li> <li>• Website</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• Other government staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>

No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
<b>Sustainability</b>				
29.	Does the project have a satisfactory risk assessment and management system in place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevance and significance of risks recorded in Project Document, UNDP Social and Environment Screening and the UNDP Risk Management Module</li> <li>• Gaps in identified risks particularly on Ethnic Armed Conflict / conflicts over land and other natural resources</li> <li>• Appropriateness of risk mitigation and management measures and effectiveness of implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• PIRs</li> <li>• Risk log from ATLAS Risk Management Module</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• UNESCO staff (in connection with Hkakaborazi World Heritage nomination)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Financial risks to sustainability</b>				
30.	How will project results including systems and processes put in place by the project be sustained financially after the end of the project and scaled up and replicated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential sources of government finance to sustain and further build on project results in the 4 demonstration sites</li> <li>• Non-government sources of potential finance (e.g. Myanmar Biodiversity Conservation Fund)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• Other government staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Socio-economic risks to sustainability</b>				
31.	Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree of key stakeholder ownership of project objective and outcomes</li> <li>• Level of public awareness and support for PAs &amp; biodiversity conservation in Myanmar</li> <li>• Status of peace process &amp; conflicts over land and natural resources in Myanmar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>• Reports on peace process and conflicts over natural resources</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Field visits</li> </ul>



No.	Evaluative questions	Indicators/criteria	Data sources	Methodology
<b>Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability</b>				
32.	Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes support post-project continuation of the results achieved, processes initiated, and systems put in place by the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportiveness of the legal framework</li> <li>• Appropriateness and supportiveness of governance structures and processes</li> <li>• Likely status of institutional capacity by the end of the project</li> <li>• Potential for developing influential project champions</li> <li>• Potential for mainstreaming PAs/project strategies into government planning processes at national and subnational levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• Other government staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental risks to sustainability</b>				
33.	Are there any environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project's outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likelihood of natural hazards (drought, floods, earthquakes)</li> <li>• Climate change impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/PIRs</li> <li>• ATLAS Risk Log</li> <li>• WCS Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP staff</li> <li>• MONREC staff</li> <li>• CSOs</li> <li>• Community members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Note: The evaluative questions follow Chapter 3 of the UNDP-GEF Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-Financed Projects and the MTR ToRs</b>				