

## ANNEX 8 Progress towards Results Matrix (progress of outcomes against end-of-project targets)

Achievement Ratings Key: HS=Highly Satisfactory; S=Satisfactory; MS=Moderately Satisfactory; MU=Moderately Unsatisfactory; U=Unsatisfactory; HU=Highly Unsatisfactory

Mid-term Assessment of progress towards End of Project (EoP) targets: Red = At risk of not being achieved and needs attention; Yellow = Partially achieved/ On target to be achieved but needs attention; Green=Achieved; Grey = Data deficient

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT GOAL:** To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Myanmar

Project Strategy	Indicator Key: 1. Hukaung = Hukaung Valley Wildlife Sanctuary = 2. Hkakaborazi or Hk NP = Hkakaborazi National Park 3. Hponkanrazi or Hp WS = Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary 4. Htamanthi or Ht WS = Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary 5. FD = Forest Department	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target (EoP)	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Justification for Rating																							
Objective: Strengthen the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing	<p>1. Increased coverage of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic PA network managed by the Forest Department to 10% (6,765,530 ha) of the country's land-area from the current 5.6% (3,788,697 ha) with increased coverage of under-represented ecoregions and essential corridors (see inset table)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Ecoregion</th> <th colspan="3">% Protected</th> <th rowspan="2">Change over Baseline</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Baseline (2014)</th> <th>End of Project Target</th> <th>MTR 2018</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Chin Hills-Arakan Yoma montane forest</td> <td>3.60%</td> <td>3.60%</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Himalayan alpine shrub and meadow</td> <td>96.46%</td> <td>96.46%</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Irrawaddy dry Forest</td> <td>0.45%</td> <td>3.0%</td> <td><b>0.45%</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Ecoregion	% Protected			Change over Baseline	Baseline (2014)	End of Project Target	MTR 2018	Chin Hills-Arakan Yoma montane forest	3.60%	3.60%	-	-	Eastern Himalayan alpine shrub and meadow	96.46%	96.46%	-	-	Irrawaddy dry Forest	0.45%	3.0%	<b>0.45%</b>	<b>0</b>	<p>5.6% coverage (3,788,697 ha) of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.</p> <p>See inset table for baseline representation of ecoregions.</p>	N/A	10% coverage (6,765,530 ha) of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, with increased coverage of under-represented ecoregions (see inset table)	<p>5.6% (3,818,749 ha Source: NWCD 12.03.2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ One new PA, Inkhinebum National Park (30,052 ha) gazetted increasing coverage by less than 0.1%. 14 proposed PAs at different stages of gazettelement.</li> <li>❖ No increase in coverage of target ecoregions in the PA network (see rows in</li> </ul>	MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Slow rate of terrestrial PA system expansion and increased ecological representation within the system</li> <li>❖ However, a 10% PA system expansion target – almost double the baseline – is potentially over-ambitious and not aligned with national policy which aims for only 8% PA coverage by 2020 (NBSAP 2015-2020); 10% PA</li> </ul>
Ecoregion	% Protected			Change over Baseline																										
	Baseline (2014)	End of Project Target	MTR 2018																											
Chin Hills-Arakan Yoma montane forest	3.60%	3.60%	-	-																										
Eastern Himalayan alpine shrub and meadow	96.46%	96.46%	-	-																										
Irrawaddy dry Forest	0.45%	3.0%	<b>0.45%</b>	<b>0</b>																										

	Irrawaddy fresh water swamp forest (Potential to increase limited)	0.04%	N/A	-	-				yellow in table in Indicator column) but slight increase in Northern Triangle subtropical forest (green row) which is already well covered by PA network.	coverage is a national goal for 2030.
	Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest	1.82%	3.0%	1.82%	0					❖ Only 21/40 PAs have dedicated park (i.e. NWCD) staff – and only 1/20 PAs has an approved management plan. A further 4 PA management plans are under review by MONREC.
	Kayah-Karen montane rain forest	0.60%	1.5%	0.60%	0					
	Mizoram-Manipur-Kachin Rain forest	7.26%	7.26%	-	-					
	Myanmar Coast mangrove	0.92%	3.0%	0.92%	0					
	Myanmar coastal rain forest (Potential to increase limited)	0.69%	N/A	-	-					
	Northern Indochina subtropical forest (Potential to increase limited)	0.90%	N/A	-	-					
	Northern Triangle subtropical forest	35.56%	35.56%	36.01	+0.46%					
	Nujiang Langcang Gorge alpine conifer and mixed forest	0.00%	3.0%	0.00%	0					
	Tenasserim-south Thailand semi-evergreen rain forest	5.16%	25.0%	0%	0					
	Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests	6.04%	6.04%	-	-					
									❖ Slow rate of gazettelement of proposed PAs since 2013 will make it challenging to achieve even the NBSAP target of 8% PA coverage by the end of the project.	
									❖ Achieving targets on increased ecological representation in the PA network will also be difficult to meet as a result, especially of including 25% of Tenasserim-south Thailand semi-evergreen rainforest in PAs managed by the Forest Department due to indigenous people's concerns about PA establishment in Thanintharyi Region (see Section 4.1.1)	

	<p>2. Improved habitat conditions at local level indicated by percentage change in forest cover caused by encroachment in Core Areas of PAs measured through remote sensing three times during the project.</p> <p>Original baseline rates of deforestation and end of project targets based on national average rates from 2013:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="430 440 949 780"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected Area</th> <th>National rate of forest cover loss (2013) (%/ year)</th> <th>Target rate of forest cover loss (%/ year)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hk</td> <td>0.95%</td> <td>0.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hp WS</td> <td>0.95%</td> <td>0.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HV WS</td> <td>0.95%</td> <td>0.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ht WS</td> <td>0.95%</td> <td>0.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>April 2018: Revised baseline annual rate of forest cover change (average for 2001-2014), end of project targets and annual rate of forest cover loss in 2016 &amp; 2017 using the same methodology and data sets from the University of Maryland.  <a href="http://www.glad.umd.edu/projects/global-forest-watch">http://www.glad.umd.edu/projects/global-forest-watch</a></p> <p>2018 data from University of Maryland is expected in June 2018.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="396 1094 972 1382"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Protected Areas</th> <th rowspan="2">Revised Base-line (2001-14)</th> <th colspan="2">Recalculated values</th> <th rowspan="2">Revised EoP Target</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2016</th> <th>2017</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hkakaborazi</td> <td>0.021</td> <td>0.024</td> <td>0.012</td> <td>0.010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hponkanrazi WS</td> <td>0.019</td> <td>0.010</td> <td>0.015</td> <td>0.010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hukaung Valley WS</td> <td>0.108</td> <td>0.106</td> <td>0.137</td> <td>0.100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Protected Area	National rate of forest cover loss (2013) (%/ year)	Target rate of forest cover loss (%/ year)	Hk	0.95%	0.5%	Hp WS	0.95%	0.5%	HV WS	0.95%	0.5%	Ht WS	0.95%	0.5%	Protected Areas	Revised Base-line (2001-14)	Recalculated values		Revised EoP Target	2016	2017	Hkakaborazi	0.021	0.024	0.012	0.010	Hponkanrazi WS	0.019	0.010	0.015	0.010	Hukaung Valley WS	0.108	0.106	0.137	0.100	<p>0.95%</p> <p>Source: Project Document</p>	<p>See inset table</p>	<p>0.5%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Data reported in the 2016 and 2017 PIRs could not be compared against each other or the baseline due to different methods having been used to estimate forest cover change in each year and lack of updated site-specific baselines (see Table 12, main report).</li> <li>❖ Baseline rates of forest cover change and rates in 2016 and 2017 were re-calculated during the MTR using a third method: the web-based google earth engine and the University of Maryland's dataset on deforestation.</li> <li>❖ Baseline rates in all 4 sites appear to be significantly lower than the national average of 0.95% for roughly the same period, although forest loss appears to have increased in Hukaung Valley WS in</li> </ul>	<p>MS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Overall rates of forest cover loss appear to be significantly lower than the national average rate prior to 2014, but it is difficult to interpret the inter-annual variation and changes from the baseline in each site without more information and further data.</li> <li>❖ The accuracy of the data and reliability of the method used to assess forest cover change needs to be further validated by the project</li> <li>❖ End of project targets should also be reconfirmed and potentially increased for all sites except Hukaung Valley WS after validating the data analysis methods and results</li> <li>❖ Additional contextual information could be generated if project monitoring and reporting of this indicator is combined with site-specific</li> </ul>
Protected Area	National rate of forest cover loss (2013) (%/ year)	Target rate of forest cover loss (%/ year)																																										
Hk	0.95%	0.5%																																										
Hp WS	0.95%	0.5%																																										
HV WS	0.95%	0.5%																																										
Ht WS	0.95%	0.5%																																										
Protected Areas	Revised Base-line (2001-14)	Recalculated values		Revised EoP Target																																								
		2016	2017																																									
Hkakaborazi	0.021	0.024	0.012	0.010																																								
Hponkanrazi WS	0.019	0.010	0.015	0.010																																								
Hukaung Valley WS	0.108	0.106	0.137	0.100																																								

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Htamanthi WS</td> <td>0.018</td> <td>0.003</td> <td>0.011</td> <td>0.010</td> </tr> </table>	Htamanthi WS	0.018	0.003	0.011	0.010				<p>2017 which may be related to the on-going conflicts.</p> <p>❖ Interpretation of these data should be combined with additional contextual information and ideally some field verification using SMART patrol data. A longer time series (5-10 years) of data is needed to detect any trends.</p>		<p>indicators on threat reduction (2.1), populations of indicator species (2.2) and management effectiveness (2.3)</p>
Htamanthi WS	0.018	0.003	0.011	0.010								
	3. Financial Sustainability of PA System (measured through Financial Sustainability Scorecard)	15% (October 2013)	N/A	25%	<p>24%</p> <p>See Financial Sustainability Scorecard for scoring and details of changes in policy, legal and regulatory framework for PA financing and other aspects of sustainability. Since the last PIR, work has begun together with NWCD to explore the feasibility of establishing an independent Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund as a potential source of additional funding for important PA activities which would <b>not</b> be undertaken by</p>	S	<p>❖ End of project target nearly met although this was likely set too low and should now be revised upwards to enhance sustainability of project outcomes.</p>					

					government but rather by community-based organizations or NGOs and would complement government PA management activities		
					<p><b>Likelihood of Achieving Project Objective: Partly on track</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ While further expansion of the PA network is very likely, it may still not be possible to meet the revised 8% target or the current ecoregion coverage targets</li> <li>❖ Progress to date under Outcomes 1 &amp; 2 (see below) strongly indicate that management effectiveness and sustainability of the PA system is likely to be significantly strengthened by the end of the project.</li> <li>❖ Among the 4 pilot sites, significant improvements in management effectiveness are most likely in Htamanthi WS where project</li> </ul>	MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ There is meaningful progress on all aspects of PA system strengthening, but there are also delays in project implementation and on-going challenges to PA system expansion and effective management.</li> <li>❖ Although the project has nearly met its original end of project target for financial sustainability, the PA system is still very far from being well or sustainably financed</li> <li>❖ Project implementation in 3/4 demonstration sites delayed or stalled. There is potential to overcome this before the end of the project in Hponkanrazi and Hkakaborazi.</li> <li>❖ It is difficult to assess change in habitat conditions in the</li> </ul>

					<p>implementation is most advanced. Activities in Hponkanrazi WS could only begin after park staff were assigned to the PA in December 2017. Only limited activities have been possible in Hukaung Valley WS due to the deteriorating security conditions there. Project implementation in Hkakaborazi has been stalled since September 2017 due to the protests against the proposed Southern Extension PA linked to the government's World Heritage Nomination proposal (Para 94).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Financial sustainability is also likely to be strengthened as a result of both increased government funding for PAs and new financing mechanisms that will be possible as a result of recent policy changes</li> </ul>	<p>project sites based on the existing indicator measurements although site-specific deforestation rates appear to be significantly lower than the national average</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Justification for Rating
Outcome 1: Enhanced systemic, institutional and financial frameworks for PA expansion and management	<p>1.1. Strengthened national policies and legislation address the following key issues for the PA system:</p> <p>a) enabling PAs to have access to funds raised through sustainable financing mechanism;</p> <p>b) integrating valuation of ecosystem services (ES) into national land use planning;</p> <p>c) clarifying the legal status of PA buffer zones and rationalization of approaches toward them;</p> <p>d) clarifying the governance arrangements for coastal PAs; and</p> <p>e) enabling local people to use and benefit from sites within Protected Areas.</p> <p><u>Progress reported in 2017 PIR:</u></p> <p>a) Chin State allocated budget to Natmataung NP</p> <p>b) WCS &amp; FD planning ecosystem mapping to integrate in landuse planning</p> <p>c) WCS facilitated buffer zoning process in the management plan development for the proposed Hkakaborazi Landscape World Heritage nomination as well as for Htamanthi</p>	<p>a) PAs currently only access government funding;</p> <p>b) values of ES not considered in national land use planning;</p> <p>c) PA buffer zones vary in location and legal status;</p> <p>d) governance responsibilities for coastal PAs are complex and unclear;</p> <p>e) local people have no legal use rights within PAs</p>	See Indicator column	<p>a) PAs can access diverse sources of funding for management</p> <p>b) national land use planning policy incorporates valuation of ES</p> <p>c) PA buffer zones are given specific and consistent legal recognition;</p> <p>d) governance of coastal PAs is clarified in national policy and law;</p> <p>e) legislation passed to enable local</p>	<p>There has been greater and more directly relevant progress against some of the 'sub-indicators' for Indicator 1.1 since the 2017 PIR mainly as a result of the new Biodiversity and Conservation of PAs Law, which holds great potential for delivering results under Outcome 1.1. This was approved in May 2018. However, the extent of change that results will depend on the rules and regulations that are developed to guide the implementation of the law.</p> <p>a) The new Biodiversity and Conservation of PAs Law will allow PAs to access new forms of non-government funding.</p>	MS	<p>There are still uncertainties around how the new Biodiversity &amp; Conservation of PAs law will be applied. Much will depend on the finalization and adoption of the associated rules and regulations and how these will apply to individual PAs.</p> <p>The Land Use Policy has been reviewed by a legal review committee of Parliament but is yet to be approved and adopted.</p> <p>The project is planning some practical steps to support the application of the new law and its rules and regulations by developing Departmental Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and Instructions for amongst other things c) clarifying and managing use of PA buffer zones &amp; e) enabling local people to use and</p>

	<p>d) WCS participated in government-initiated integrated coastal resource management system workshop in July 2017</p> <p>e) Community land use and resource use rights and practices recorded through participatory mapping processes in 20 villages in the proposed Southern Extension to Hkakaborazi as an input to the land settlement process for establishing the Southern Extension PA.</p>			<p>use of land within PAs with appropriate safeguards.</p>	<p>b) While the project is working on a more refined ecosystem mapping with NWCDS, the project has not undertaken any work specifically on integrating ecosystem service values into national land use planning as the new National Land Use Policy is yet to be adopted by government.</p> <p>c) There is no explicit legal recognition of PA buffer zones in the new Biodiversity and Conservation of PAs law and buffer zones still lack clear definitions and legal status. However, the draft rules and regulations of the new law may provide a mechanism for providing this.</p> <p>d) The project has not had time to engage systematically on coastal PA governance since the July 2017 workshop.</p> <p>e) The new Biodiversity &amp; Conservation of PAs</p>	<p>benefit from sites within PAs.</p> <p>A new opportunity has arisen at the subnational level in 2018 to contribute to the Kachin State Environment Action Plan (see Section 4.2)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--



					law has provisions to enable local communities to use PA buffer zones as well as to participate in PA management and establish community PAs.		
	<p>1.2. Improved institutional capacity of the Forest Department for the PA system planning and management as indicated by the Capacity Development Scorecard*</p> <p>*Combined average for NWCD, Sagaing Region FD, Kachin State FD, the FD Training and Research Development Division and the FD Planning and Statistics Division</p>	<p>56%</p> <p>Range: 48-65%</p> <p>(Note: This is a revised unadjusted baseline average – see main report Paras 138-139 for further explanation. Original baseline: 45%)</p>	N/A	<p>67%</p> <p>(Note: Original target, may need to be revised upwards)</p>	<p>63%</p> <p>Range: 50-71%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ TAGPA formed under chairmanship of NWCD Director &amp; convened in May 2017 but its role and functions have changed from what was originally envisage</li> <li>❖ Capacity assessment for PA management by NWCD completed</li> <li>❖ Capacity Development Strategy &amp; Roadmap drafted and currently being updated in Myanmar language before updating English version.</li> </ul>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ There is steady progress on institutional capacity development of the FD at national, subnational and local levels as reflected in responses from the directors of NWCD, Sagaing &amp; Kachin FDs, PSD &amp; TRDD</li> <li>❖ The role and functioning of TAGPA needs to be revisited</li> <li>❖ The Capacity Development Strategy &amp; Roadmap need to be finalized and formally approved by the Project Board.</li> </ul>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Action Plan for implementing capacity development roadmap for NWCS, Myanmar Forest School (MFS) and University of Forestry &amp; Environmental Science (UoFES) under preparation</li> <li>❖ Park staff capacity increased through provision of trained Community Guards for law enforcement and Community Guardians for biological monitoring and community outreach in all demonstration sites but at greatest scale and most effectively in Htamanthi to date</li> <li>❖ National and subnational FD capacity strengthened through project trainings of over 300 FD staff on different aspects of PA management &amp; planning, including community</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					engagement, SMART patrolling, biodiversity monitoring and participatory community forestry		
	<p>1.3. Certificate-level PA management modules are established for the use of the Forest Department and incorporated into their regular curricula at Yezin University of Forestry and Central Forestry Development Training Center (CFDTC) as appropriate</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p>1. Yezin University of Forestry has been renamed University of Forestry &amp; Environmental Science (UoFES)</p> <p><u>Progress reported in 2017 PIR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Capacity Development Strategy for NWCD developed and presented to TAGPA who recommended it be expanded to whole of FD.</li> <li>❖ Training on law enforcement, natural resource management and governance, gender assessment and community guardians delivered to 368 people of which, 115 were FD staff, 63 WCS staff, 183 from local communities and 7 from INGOs and local CSOs.</li> </ul>	No formal training courses on PA management are available in Myanmar	See Indicator column	<p>Certificate-level PA management modules are incorporated into regular curricula at UoFES and CFDTC.</p> <p>At least 150 FD field staff trained and certified in Conservation Management and Community Outreach for PAs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Agreement reached with UoFES in Feb 2018 to develop a curriculum for its new Department of Biodiversity and Wildlife Conservation and to improve the Wildlife Conservation Syllabus of 4th year students of UoFES. Consultants hired to begin the work.</li> <li>❖ Basic Wildlife / Biodiversity Conservation and PA Management Certificate Course targeting Forest Guards and Foresters under development in cooperation with NWCD, FFI &amp; WWF. Trainings to be conducted annually. First six-week certificate training course to be held in June 2018. A key feature is that this</li> </ul>	MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Given that reaching agreement on changing existing curricula and developing new training courses and institutionalizing these is a lengthy process, progress to date on this is considered a good achievement.</li> <li>❖ Work underway to develop teaching modules for the certificate course and for MFS &amp; CFDTC.</li> <li>❖ The plans to institutionalize the courses in MFS and UoFES are promising. The new curriculum for MFS diploma students will be launched in 2019. Training of lecturers at MFS is also planned.</li> <li>❖ The impact and effectiveness of numerous short</li> </ul>

					<p>course will be open to women for the first time unlike the course offered by the Myanmar Forest School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ A six module training curriculum on Biodiversity Conservation and PA management covering six weeks is under development for inclusion in the two-year Diploma Course for foresters at Myanmar Forest School</li> <li>❖ Modules for periodic short (1-week) on Biodiversity Conservation and PA management under development for use by CFDTC for in-service training and refresher courses for all FD field staff from forest guards to park wardens.</li> </ul>		<p>trainings and workshops needs to be monitored and evaluated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Good coordination is needed between the project/WCS, NWCD and WWF in relation to a recent proposal to establish a dedicated Myanmar Wildlife College to ensure the work undertaken through this project is not duplicated or wasted.</li> </ul>
	1.4. 100% increase in total budget allocated to the protected areas in real terms compared to the baseline as indicated by the financial sustainability scorecard	US\$ 1,012,642  Note: Updated baseline for 2013-14. Refers		100% increase in budget allocated to the protected areas in real	US\$ 1,239,368	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Proposing to double the central government budget for PAs over 5 years is an ambitious target given Myanmar's</li> </ul>

	<p>Notes The original baseline figure given in the Project Document was US\$ 750,000<sup>1</sup> per year. A slightly higher figure of US\$ 883,605 in original was given in the METT completed at the time of project approval. The revised figure is believed to be the most accurate as it is based on a later review of planned and actual budgets and expenditures by an external consultant.</p>	to central government budget		terms compared to baseline			<p>on-going political transition and the many competing demands on scarce government resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ A 25% increase in central government budget over 3 years is therefore considered a satisfactory achievement.</li> <li>❖ Indicator &amp; target are identical however. These need to be clarified and adapted.</li> </ul>
					<p><b>Likelihood of Achieving of Outcome 1: Partly on track</b></p> <p>There are many promising results under Outcome 1, notably development of institutional capacity for PA system planning and management, the institutionalization of training courses on different aspects and increased government financing for PAs. However, the project risks spreading itself</p>	MS	<p>Outcome 1 is rated overall as Moderately Satisfactory despite 3 out of 4 Outcome 1 Indicators being rated as Satisfactory. This is due to the limited progress on strengthening the national PA policy framework, which is a cornerstone of the long-term sustainability of the PA system.</p> <p>The new Biodiversity &amp; Conservation of PAs law, will be a major step in that direction but more detailed rules &amp;</p>

<sup>1</sup>Based on the exchange rate of 800 kyat = 1 US\$.

					<p>too thin by undertaking too many activities with insufficient M&amp;E and critical analysis of their impact and effectiveness. Greater and more systematic action is needed to: (a) deliver concrete policy outputs under Output 1.1; (b) evaluate the impact and effectiveness of current trainings and workshops under Output 1.2 and adapt as needed; and (c) advance work on developing a system-wide PA financing strategy (Output 1.3)</p>		<p>regulations will still need to be developed before it can be effectively applied. There has also been limited progress on developing a sustainable financing strategy for the PA system (Output 1.3). As there is no indicator linked to this output, progress is also not systematically tracked.</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications																																								
Outcome 2. Strengthened management and threat reduction in the target PAs and buffer zones	<p><b>Original Indicator:</b></p> <p>2.1. Reduction of threats at the local level indicated by an eventual reduction in the number of individuals stopped inside the PA for illegal activities as shown in SMART monthly patrolling reports.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Protected Area</th> <th rowspan="2">SMART Baseline *</th> <th colspan="5">SMART Target*</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Y1</th> <th>Y2</th> <th>Y3</th> <th>Y4</th> <th>Y5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>HV WS (HV)</td> <td>20</td> <td>30</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hk (Hk)</td> <td>20</td> <td>30</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hp WS (Hp)</td> <td>0</td> <td>10</td> <td>20</td> <td>15</td> <td>8</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ht WS (Ht)</td> <td>20</td> <td>30</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Catch effort /100km patrol distance</p> <p>Notes: Catch effort refers to the number of actions taken by patrol teams when they come across an illegal activity.</p>	Protected Area	SMART Baseline *	SMART Target*					Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	HV WS (HV)	20	30	40	30	15	10	Hk (Hk)	20	30	40	30	15	10	Hp WS (Hp)	0	10	20	15	8	5	Ht WS (Ht)	20	30	40	30	15	10	See inset table	See inset table	See inset table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Difficult to interpret or assess change in threat level at each site using original reported threat reduction indicator of total number of actions taken by patrol teams for every 100 km patrolled, i.e. catch effort (see Section 4.2 for further details).</li> <li>❖ As all SMART patrolling data are recorded in a database, it was agreed to retrofit this indicator during the MTR to make it a more meaningful measure of change in threat levels for the remainder of the project.</li> <li>❖ Only Htamanthi has annual data since the start of the project. These show a steady reduction in the number of people, camps and hunting weapons encountered while</li> </ul>	Not rated (see main report Paras 158-163)	Insufficient data for a meaningful achievement rating. See main report Sections 4.2, 4.3.5 and 4.3.6
Protected Area	SMART Baseline *			SMART Target*																																											
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5																																									
HV WS (HV)	20	30	40	30	15	10																																									
Hk (Hk)	20	30	40	30	15	10																																									
Hp WS (Hp)	0	10	20	15	8	5																																									
Ht WS (Ht)	20	30	40	30	15	10																																									

Project Strategy	Indicator					Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
	<b>Proposed new indicators for threat reduction</b>								patrolling since 2014-15 even as patrolling distance has gone up. ❖ Baselines were established for Hkakaborazi and Hponkanrazi in 2015-2016, the latter through patrolling undertaken by Hkakaborazi staff as Hponkanrazi did not receive permanent staff till December 2017. ❖ There are still a few problems with how SMART patrolling data are being collected and reported e.g. patrolling data collected by foot and boat in Htamanthi have been lumped together; in Hukaung SMART patrolling is all done by road and only along the main Ledo Road due to security problems. These issues are discussed in Section 4.2 and 4.3.5 and 4..3.6		
	<b>PA</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline 2015</b>	<b>Baseline / PIR 2016</b>	<b>PIR 2017</b>	<b>EoP Target</b>					
	Hk	Patrol Distance (km)	N/A	1,506	2,412	3,000					
		Total Peoples encountered	N/A	29	63	30					
		Total Camps encountered	N/A	19	21	10					
		Total hunting weapons encountered	N/A	184	310	100					
	Hp WS	Patrol Distance (km)	N/A	402	N/A	2,000					
		Total Peoples encountered	N/A	35	N/A	30					
		Total Camps encountered	N/A	33	N/A	10					
		Total hunting weapons encountered	N/A	157	N/A	100					



Project Strategy	Indicator					Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
	HV WS	Patrol Distance (km)	N/A	201	4,776	6,000					
		Total Peoples encountered	N/A	0	48	30					
		Total Camps encountered	N/A	0	12	10					
		Total hunting weapons encountered	N/A	26	31	20					
	Ht WS	Patrol Distance (km)	4,196	6,133	116,193	130,000					
		Total Peoples encountered	3,274	1,806	948	500					
		Total Camps encountered	33	29	31	20					
		Total hunting weapons encountered	993	152	38	20					
2.2. Stable or increased encounter rates for key indicator species in each demonstration PA based on annual summaries of SMART patrolling data and focused auditory surveys for gibbons.	See inset table for updated baselines and	See inset table	See inset table for revised	❖ Gibbon group density in Htamanthi appears to be stable so far based on auditory surveys, which are likely more	MS	Excluding Hukaung Valley WS where the situation is outside the control of the					

Project Strategy	Indicator						Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
	PA	Indicator	Base-line	PIR 2016	PIR 2017	EoP Target	indicator species for each project site. This includes an additional group of indicator species for Htamanthi – medium-sized cats		EoP targets	<p>reliable than the SMART patrolling results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Ungulate encounter rates in Hkakaborazi and Hponkanrazi appear to be reasonably stable although it is too early to be sure of population trends.</li> <li>❖ Ungulate encounter rates from Htamanthi are problematic because SMART patrolling data collected by boat and foot cannot be disaggregated and because a greater patrolling distance was conducted by boat. This may explain the low ungulate encounter rate in Htamanthi, which is a lower than the rates in Hkakaborazi and Hponkanrazi, which seems odd, given that a) Htamanthi has populations of tiger and other cats and b)</li> </ul>		<p>project, most indicator species encounter rates are stable or higher than the baseline, although there are some limitations to the use of SMART data for assessing this indicator.</p>
HV WS	Ungulate encounter rate per 100 km patrol distance (SMART data)	0.3	0.1	0.2	1.0							
Hk	Ungulate encounter rate per 100 km patrol distance (SMART data)	5.0	5.9	5.1	6.0							
Hp WS	Ungulate encounter rate per 100 km patrol distance (SMART data)	5.0	5.2	No data	6.0							
Hp WS	Hoolock Gibbon group density per Km <sup>2</sup> (Auditory survey)	2	N/A	N/A	2							
Ht WS	Ungulate encounter rate per 100 km patrol distance (SMART data)	0.3	0.5	0.2	1.0							
Ht WS	Hoolock Gibbon group density per Km <sup>2</sup> (Auditory survey)	2	2.32	2.13	2							
Ht WS	Medium cats relative	0.17	0.77	0.94	1.5							

Project Strategy	Indicator				Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications								
	abundance per 100 trap nights (Camera trap survey)							<p>SMART patrolling data also show a reduction of illegal activities.</p> <p>❖ 2018 survey data results not available. Two years of data are insufficient for detecting a trend in population change in the indicator species or for drawing any meaningful conclusions from inter-annual variation in the encounter rate of indicator species. It is reassuring there are no steep declines however.</p>										
	<p>2.3 Improved management effectiveness of individual PAs covering 2,604,000 ha, indicated by the % increase in the METT assessment</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected Area</th> <th>METT Baseline Score</th> <th>METT 2018 Score</th> <th>METT End of Project Target Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Hukaung Valley WS WS (1,737,300 ha)</td> <td>52%</td> <td>48%</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Protected Area	METT Baseline Score	METT 2018 Score	METT End of Project Target Score	Hukaung Valley WS WS (1,737,300 ha)	52%	48%	82%	See inset table for METT Baseline scores	N/A	See inset table for Baseline & End of Project METT Target scores	<p>See inset table for 2018 Mid-term level</p> <p>METT scores have improved for all the project sites except for Hukaung Valley WS, which is not surprising given the deteriorating security situation. Greatest improvement from the</p>	MS	Despite improved METT scores for all project sites except Hukaung Valley WS which is outside the project's control, an MS rating is given because of the situation in
Protected Area	METT Baseline Score	METT 2018 Score	METT End of Project Target Score															
Hukaung Valley WS WS (1,737,300 ha)	52%	48%	82%															

Project Strategy	Indicator				Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
	Hkakaborazi NP (381,200 ha)	51%	58%	83%				<p>baseline has been at: 1) Hponkanrazi which has had new infrastructure and park staff since December 2017 2) Htamanthi where project activities have accelerated in 2017. Management plans are under development for all 4 project sites, the most advanced ones are for Hponkanrazi and Hkakaborazi . See METT for each site for further information (Annex 11) If project implementation continues at the present rate in Htamanthi and continues to accelerate in Hponkanrazi, end of project targets are likely to be met.</p> <p>The situation in Hkakaborazi where implementation has stalled since September 2017 is a major concern and unless addressed quickly will impact progress towards</p>		<p>Hkakaborazi. This needs to be urgently addressed through strategies to rebuild the trust of local communities and continue project implementation although approaches may need to be adapted.</p>
	Hponkanrazi WS (270,400 ha)	12%	39%	69%						
	Htamanthi WS (215,100)	49%	61%	82%						

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
					<p>EoP targets for this site and impact Outcome level results.</p> <p>Also of note is the increasing interagency dialogue and cooperation are being strengthened through the establishment of PA Management Coordination Committees (PAMCC) at state/region, district and township levels in Sagaing and Kachin</p>		
	2.4 Community participation systems piloted at demonstration PAs and incorporated into management plans	No existing systematic measures for community participation at demonstration PAs	161 community members from three project sites trained as Community Guardians	Community participation systems piloted at demonstration PAs and incorporated into	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Both indicator and EoP target are not only identical but also vague and need to be 'SMART'ened up.</li> <li>❖ Reporting in the 2016 &amp; 2017 PIRs does not explain the Community Guardian system or its value/impacts – only the number of people trained.</li> <li>❖ Several interesting community participation</li> </ul>	S	Community engagement is a slow process as is identifying and developing effective community participating systems appropriate to a given area. Relatively little budget is invested in piloting community

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/ Justifications
				management plans	<p>systems are being explored and piloted at all project sites except Hukaung Valley WS including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ a vibrant Community Guardians program that supports biological monitoring and other PA activities by the FD in 3 PAs but most advanced in Htamanthi</li> <li>❖ a Community Guards program that supplements FD PA capacity for law enforcement and monitoring of illegal activities through SMART patrolling in 3 PAs but most advanced in Htamanthi</li> <li>❖ Community Forestry in the PA buffer zone supported by a strong, participatory community engagement process in Htamanthi</li> <li>❖ A community-based ecotourism proposal for</li> </ul>		<p>participation systems. However, where the project has invested as in Htamanthi, there are promising results as a result of strong community mobilization with both the FD and local communities perceiving value in the different programs that are being implemented here.</p> <p>Also noteworthy are the participatory processes that are being used by the Community Engagement Team such as the Village Consultation</p>

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/ Justifications
					<p>the Hkakaborazi landscape, which is currently stalled</p> <p>See main report / Section 4.2 for further details.</p>		Process, and the Village Use Zoning Process that are being used to develop detailed Participatory Land Use Plans that map traditional boundaries and uses and seek to strengthen local tenure over land resources.
					<p><b>Likelihood of Achieving Outcome 2: Partly on track</b></p> <p>As with Outcome 1, the project is delivering some good results under Outcome 2, particularly in relation to testing new community participation models. There are also indications of improved management effectiveness and threat reduction, especially in Htamanthi where project</p>	MS	Insufficient progress at most sites other than Htamanthi. Scale is still limited and there are challenges to working in at least two of the four demonstration sites. It is difficult to assess progress on threat reduction and change in indicator species

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
					<p>implementation has been taking place for longer. However, further progress in Hukaung Valley WS is unlikely for the foreseeable future and activities have stalled in Hkakaborazi since September 2017, while those in Hponkanrazi have only started in earnest in 2018 once park staff were in place. It will be difficult for the project to deliver any major results in these sites in the remaining time without prioritizing and accelerating interventions. A mini intervention strategy and action plan for each site would help plan and guide a coherent set of actions aimed at achieving maximum sustainable impact by the end of the project.</p> <p>There are no indicators linked to Outputs 2.1 and</p>		<p>populations because of problems with the indicators and/or measurement methods.</p>



Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	2017 Level of 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	End of Project Target	2018 Mid-term Level & Assessment	Achievement Rating	Explanations/Justifications
					<p>2.4. Progress on these is thus easily overlooked. These were assessed separately during the MTR mission. Business planning for the 4 sites has still to be undertaken, while Output 2.4 (the preparation of a Law Enforcement Action Plan for Kachin) is no longer considered viable given the current political situation in the state.</p> <p>Weaknesses in both the choice of indicator and SMART data collection methods limit the usefulness of some indicators for monitoring progress towards results. These issues need to be resolved urgently.</p>		